	HAOJSEA1 Trial
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	X
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 16 Cr. 467 ALC
5	NORMAN SEABROOK AND MURRAY HUBERFELD,
6	Defendants.
7	x
8	
9	
10	October 24, 2017 8:50 a.m.
11	0.00 a.m.
12	
13	Before:
14	HON. ANDREW L. CARTER, JR.,
15	District Judge and a jury
16	and a jury
17	
18	APPEARANCES
19	JOON H. KIM,
20	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York
21	KAN MIN NAWADAY, MARTIN BELL,
22	RUSSELL CAPONE, Assistant United States Attorneys
23	
24	
25	

	HAOUSEAL ITIAL
1	
2	APPEARANCES (Continued)
3	
4	BRACEWELL, LLP, Attorneys for defendant Seabrook
5	BY: PAUL LEWIS SHECHTMAN, Esq. MARGARET EMMA LYNAUGH, Esq.
6	Of counsel
7	
8	MAZUREK LIPTON, LLP Attorneys for defendant Huberfeld BY: HENRY EDWARD MAZUREK, Esq. EVAN LOREN LIPTON, Esq. Of counsel
9	
10	
11	
12	Also Present: BARD HUBBARD, Special Agent FBI YOLANDA BUSTILLO, Paralegal USAO AUGUSTA GRANQUIST, Paralegal
13 14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

We have

HAOJSEA1 Trial

(In open court; jury not present) 1 2 MR. SHECHTMAN: I got a call from Mr. Mazurek, who 3 said --4 THE COURT: You have to speak up, counsel. Speak into 5 the mike. 6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: -- I got a call from Mr. Mazurek, who 7 said he and Mr. Lipton were on the West Side Highway where traffic does not seem to be very good and they said they would 8 9 be closer to 9:00. We may be closer to 9:00 already. They 10 knew they were running somewhat late. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I'll hang out back here. Let me 12 know as soon as counsel gets here. 13 MR. BELL: Your Honor, once counsel does get here, can 14 we have a brief sidebar in the robing room, very briefly? MR. SCHECHTMAN: We know what it is about. We think 15 16 the robing room probably is appropriate. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: We should probably wait. I know Mr. 19 Mazurek's position on it. If it is useful, we can go forward 20 and he can just confirm. I leave it up to the court. 21 MR. BELL: It may be wise for us to wait until Mr. 22 Mazurek gets here. It will be quick once it happens. 23 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 24 (Recess)

THE COURT: All right. Is counsel here yet?

25

got a call Mr. Mazurek was downstairs, so I guess he should be up here soon. Everyone can sit down. As soon as he gets here, we'll go in the robing room and discuss what it is that counsel want to discuss.

(Pause)

2.2

(Mr. Mazurek and Mr. Lipton entered the courtroom)

THE COURT: Counsel are here. Let's go in the robing room and discuss this matter.

(In the robing room)

THE COURT: What is up?

MR. CAPONE: Briefly, your Honor, with respect to one of the witnesses who will be our second witness, likely testifying today, Gilad Kalter, your Honor has signed an immunity order for him. I wanted to bring up two issues:

First, neither party intends to elicit his immunity, and that is because he has no exposure in this case. The immunity was as a result of the specter of exposure in the Eastern District case, which I think both sides have agreed unless any doors are opened, not to get into that case at all.

I wanted to put on the record, and I think everyone agrees we are not going to elicit, neither side will elicit he has been immunized. That is the first issue.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: That's correct.

MR. MAZUREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CAPONE: So he has to formally invoke, which is typically outside the presence of the jury. I am passing along from his lawyer, not my request, but his attorney Joana Hendon's request he invoke in the robing room at some point today before his testimony potentially during the lunch break.

I don't know what the defenses position is?

MR. SCHECHTMAN: We leave that to the court. No objection if the court wants to do it that way.

MR. MAZUREK: That's correct.

THE COURT: First of all, it is fine to let me know that counsel don't wish to bring this out. He does need to be allocuted on the immunity agreement. It seems to me, I am not sure why this needs to be done in the robing room. This is a public courtroom. It seems to me that this should be done in public, certainly out of the presence of the jury, but it seems to me this can be done publicly.

Do counsel have anything they want to say anything about that?

MR. CAPONE: Ms. Hendon will be here by noon. I don't think the witness will be on by then. Perhaps if she wants to articulate to the court her concern is press articles about his immunity in the Eastern District case and the same kind of thing that happened on Monday. I will let her — it is not our concern — I will let her raise it with the court. I don't think we will have gotten to Mr. Kalter by the lunch break

1 today.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks. Anything else we need to discuss privately?

MR. MAZUREK: I apologize. We have to get better with our logistics and make sure we are here on time tomorrow.

THE COURT: All right. Let's get back outside.

(In open court)

THE COURT: Counsel, can everyone hear me?

So, counsel, I understand we are waiting on a couple of jurors. They're at the end of the line now. They should be up soon. Let's take care of some other preliminary matters.

First of all, let me get a sense from the government as to how many witnesses you have scheduled for today and a sense of who those witnesses are.

MR. BELL: It should be two, your Honor. The first of those witnesses will be Elias Husamudeen, currently the president of the union. The second of those would be Mr. Kalter, Gilad Kalter. We strongly suspect that that will take us to the end of the day. In the event that it does not, we would expect to call Captain Michael Joy of the NYPD, who is a relatively short witness. Again we don't expect it to go that far.

THE COURT: Can I get a sense, an offer of proof on this first witness, what is this witness expected to testify about? Give me a sense of how long or short his direct

testimony will be.

MR. BELL: We expect Mr. Husamudeen's testimony will be in the order of about an hour and a half long, maybe a little longer. Some of what he is testifying to is his background, the union, correction officers generally, how the union's funds work and what they were.

Mr. Husamudeen is also a witness as to the particular circumstances of how the various tranches of money that made their way from the union to the hedge fund actually got there and defendant Seabrook was involved in that.

THE COURT: From defense counsel, do you have a rough estimate as to how long your cross-examination, if any, of this witness will be?

MR. SCHECHTMAN: I wouldn't think more than half an hour, Judge.

MR. MAZUREK: I don't think there is going to be much by Mr. Huberfeld's counsel on cross.

THE COURT: All right. So I received a letter from defense counsel last night withdrawing their previous objection to those emails coming in, so that is no longer an issue. You should have seen, I believe I posted it last night, our decision regarding the subpoenas. That has been dealt with.

Let me just ask a couple of quick questions. In terms of preliminary instructions that I will give the jury after we swear the jury, let me find out how counsel want to proceed. I

don't intend to get into any detail at all about the charges in the indictment. It seems to me it is not necessary to do that.

The indictment was summarized when the jurors filled out the original questionnaire. I can say to the jurors that the indictment is not evidence. I can say to them generally the defendants have been charged with conspiracy to commit honest services fraud as well as honest services fraud, but I don't know if that really means anything to the jury at this point, telling them that since it is still somewhat -- it hasn't been totally made clear even by our beloved Second Circuit and Supreme Court as to what that necessarily entails. I don't know if it is important to say that to the jury at this point.

What is counsel's view on whether or not I should say anything at all about the charges in my preliminary instructions. I know counsel will probably address this in their open statements.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: At least from my point of view, I don't think Mr. Mazurek will be different, less is more, as your Honor suggests. You could say the indictment is just an accusation, that would be helpful. Saying more about it I don't think is necessary. The openings should lay it all out.

MR. BELL: I think that's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The next question then is about open statements. Do counsel plan on using any sort of

demonstrative evidence? Do counsel plan on using any other sort of evidence in the opening? Has that been cleared with opposing counsel? Where are we with that?

MR. BELL: We don't plan to use anything. This will be unplugged.

THE COURT: Defense counsel?

MR. SCHECHTMAN: No demonstratives, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: None from us, your Honor.

THE COURT: That sounds good. We'll wait for the jury to get here and I will be back out when they get here. See you soon.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Here is the update. We are still waiting on one juror. There may have been a miss, mistaken ID over in the jury room, and they thought perhaps — we are waiting on Juror No. 1. All the other jurors are here and my deputy called the number she had for Juror No. 1, spoke to someone there who confirmed that juror did leave and was on way to court.

When that juror gets here, we'll go. It is my intention to wait a little bit longer for this juror to get here, and in 30 minutes at the latest we may need to revisit this. We do have alternate jurors, but I intend to wait for a while. Let me hear from counsel. What are your thoughts on this?

1 MR. BELL: Waiting sounds fine for now, your Honor.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: The same, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: See you soon.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, I have been informed that the juror is in the line and has been moved to the front of the line and is on his way up.

I don't want to do anything at this point to kind of single this juror out, but it does seem that it might be a good idea at the end of the day today to sort of remind the jurors that we need to make sure everyone gets here on time so that we can start on time, unless counsel have another idea. What do counsel want to do about that?

MR. BELL: That seems fine, your Honor.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: That is fine. One of us lawyers had the modest suggestion of saying to the jurors if they're late, we are going to run past 2:30 to make up, which might put some collective pressure on them. If the court wants to do that, there is no objection.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I don't want to do that right now. Again I want to get started. I don't want to draw unnecessary attention to that juror, but I do think that perhaps it makes sense -- we'll see where we are.

For today we'll just, I will just make sure the jury

knows it is really important we start on time so we can finish on time. If we have further issues with this, with any other jurors, it may make sense to tell them if we start late, we are going to go late. We'll wait for the juror to come up and be ready to start up with everybody good. The mikes have been checked and everything? Okay, good. The juror is here, so let's bring in the jury.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Good morning, everyone.

THE JURY: Good morning.

THE COURT: Is the jury properly seated, counsel for the government?

MR. BELL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel for the defense?

MR. SCHECHTMAN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. One second.

(Pause)

THE COURT: While we're waiting for my Deputy, what is going to happen, my wonderful and talented Deputy will come out and give you your oath as jurors. Once that happens, I will give you preliminary instructions and we'll proceed to opening statements.

The acoustics here aren't great, so we want to do a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

couple of quick mike checks. I am hearing a little reverb over there from one of the tables. Let me just, if we can get counsel to just give us a testing one or two or three on that mike.

MR. BELL: I also think the mikes are no longer operative for whatever reason. We were doing great and now we're not.

THE COURT: All right.

(Pause)

MR. BELL: We have lost everything, your Honor.

THE COURT: Hold on.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Try the lectern now.

MR. BELL: Test, test. The lectern?

THE COURT: Yes, the lectern.

MR. BELL: Test, test. I think it is a power issue.

It is a light itself here isn't actually on on either mike.

THE COURT: Let's do this. Let's ask you to go back into the jury room for just a moment while we deal with these technical issues. Don't discuss the case amongst yourself or with anyone else. We'll see you in about six minutes, okay?

(Jury excused)

(Pause)

THE COURT: Counsel, here is what we'll do. IT is on

the way. I hope they can resolve this quickly.

MR. BELL: We may have bootlegged something. We are going to move our desk's mike over here, and it seems to work at least for the moment.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: Mr. Nawaday has an engineering degree.

THE COURT: Let's break and bring with the jurors out.

Here is what we can do when counsel start their opening statement. In the event there is some technical difficulties, you can use the cordless mike that is there. If that doesn't work, instead of sending the jury back in and trying to deal with this again, what counsel can do is a little unusual, I won't take any offense at this, you can come and use my mike. It is here and you can use this mike. Let's get this opening done, okay? All right? Sound good?

MR. BELL: For what it is worth, the cordless doesn't seem to be working right now. We are a heartbeat away.

THE COURT: If that doesn't work again, feel free to let me know, I'll step down and you come up here and you can use this mike. Ready to bring the jury in?

MR. BELL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Bring the jury in.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Please be seated. I'll ask my wonderful and talented Deputy to administer the oath to the jurors.

(The jury was duly sworn and affirmed)

THE CLERK: You may be seated.

THE COURT: So I am going to give you some preliminary instructions and then we'll proceed with the opening statements. After that, you'll start hearing evidence in this case.

My job at this point and my job at the end of this case is going to be to instruct you as to the law that governs or controls this case, and I will give you those final legal instructions at the end of the trial. There are a few things I want to talk about now.

This is a criminal case. Both defendants have been indicted, and although they have been indicted, the indictment itself is not evidence. An indictment simply contains the charges that the government is required to prove to the satisfaction of you, the trial jury, beyond a reasonable doubt.

The law presumes the defendants to be innocent of all the charges against them. The burden is upon the prosecution to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt with respect to each element of the offenses charged. The burden of proof never shifts to a defendant in a criminal case and the law never imposes on a defendant the obligation of doing anything in a criminal trial.

You must pay close attention to all the evidence presented. Evidence consists only of the testimony of

witnesses, documents and other things admitted in evidence or stipulations agreed to by the attorneys.

Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you. I will list them for you now. Statements, arguments and questions by lawyers are not evidence, nor are my own statements to you. Objections to questions are not evidence.

Lawyers have an obligation to their clients to make objections when they believe evidence being offered is improper under the rules of evidence. You should not be influenced by the objection or by my ruling on it. If the objection is sustained, ignore the question and any answer that may have been given. If it its overruled, treat the answer like any other. Testimony that I exclude is not evidence and must not be considered. Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom.

You will use your common sense and good judgment to evaluate the testimony based on all the circumstances. You must keep an open mind until the trial is over. You should not reach any conclusions until you have all the evidence before you. In order to ensure that you decide the case only on the evidence and that you are not influenced in any way by anything that might occur outside the courtroom, I must give you a

specific set of instructions.

Do not discuss this case amongst yourselves or with any other person. You will have the opportunity — indeed, the duty — to discuss the case among yourselves after all the evidence is in and the case is given to you to discuss inside in the jury room. You are not to read anything in the newspapers or elsewhere about this case. You are not to listen to or view any reporting about this case if it should be broadcast on TV, over the radio or over the internet. You are not to conduct any research about this case. It is a violation of your oath as a juror to seek out your own information about the people and events in this case or to research the law.

Your considerations must be based only on what you hear and observe in the courtroom. Do not receive or send any electronic communications about the case. That includes texting, emailing, blogging, posting information on social network websites or using any other means to communicate or discuss or even mention this case. That means no communications even with fellow jurors.

If it becomes necessary to send me a note about something you saw or heard or about any other matter, do not share the content of the note with your fellow jurors. You are not to allow anyone to speak to you about this case. If you are approached by anyone who asks you to speak about it, you will tell them I have instructed you not to do so. If any

person seeks to contact you about the case, you are required to report the incident promptly to me.

Also be sure to let me know if any person you know comes into the courtroom. This is a public trial, so this could happen. It is important that you do not hear from them what may have happened in the court while the jury was not present. If you should see a friend or relative come into the court, please send a note to me, through my Deputy, at your first opportunity.

Let's talk briefly about trial procedure. First lawyers have an opportunity but are not required to make opening statements. These statements are not evidence. They're simply a preview of what they believe the evidence in this case will show. Following that, there will be testimony and other evidence presented to you. Following that, there will be closing arguments. After that, I will give you the instructions on the law.

We will now proceed with opening statements by counsel. Counsel for the government, you may begin first.

MR. BELL: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. BELL: Just one moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Okay. Could you give us a Testing 1, 2, 3 to make sure we're good here.

1 MR. BELL: Sure thing. Testing 1, 2, 3.

THE COURT: All right, counsel.

MR. BELL: May I proceed?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BELL: This man is Norman Seabrook, a powerful union leader who was willing to betray the workers who trusted him and to jeopardize their retirement benefits in exchange for a bag filled with cash.

This is Murray Huberfeld, a millionaire who was willing to pay a bribe in order to boost his business, to pay a bribe to Mr. Seabrook.

This case is about how greed, pure greed brought these men together, uniting them in a criminal scheme. It is about how these two powerful men from different corners of the city agreed to treat the union members' retirement money as a tool for their personal gain, and it is about what happened when the union leader, Mr. Seabrook, decided that his responsibilities to the rank and file workers he represented were nothing more than a thing to be bought and sold.

For two decades Mr. Seabrook was president of the union, the Correction Officers Benevolent Association, or COBA. As president of the union, Seabrook represented over 10,000 correction officers, men and women with hard, dangerous jobs. Seabrook had a lot of power of the union, and with that power came a duty to those correction officers. The union members

gave up portions of their salaries to the union, part of every paycheck. In turn, they depended on the union to safeguard their money, to help them ease their way into retirement.

Among Seabrook's duties was making sure that whatever he did with the union's money was in the best interests of the people he represented. That is not what he did.

Instead, as you'll learn, Seabrook invested that money, money that was supposed to serve as a safety net for the union and its members, with a hedge fund, a kind of business that makes risky and aggressive investments with its clients' money in order to try to make large profits.

Seabrook was willing to embrace that risk with the retirement money of tens of thousands of correction officers not because it was the right thing or the smart thing to do, but because he was getting bribed to do it. He sold out his duties to the workers he represented once he saw an opportunity to line his pockets.

The man who promised Seabrook those bribes, that was Murray Huberfeld. Murray Huberfeld had helped start a hedge fund called Platinum Partners, and he still had a lot of money, his money and his family's money, invested in it.

Around 2013 Huberfeld saw the funds needed new, big investors like pension funds and unions, and Huberfeld, as it turned out, was willing to bribe someone like Norman Seabrook in order to secure an investor like the corrections officers

union.

Together these men agreed with each other, and then in exchange for cash bribes or kickbacks from the hedge fund potentially worth about a hundred thousand dollars every year, Seabrook would steer millions of dollars of his union's money into the hedge fund. That is exactly what they did.

Over the course of 2014, Norman Seabrook directed millions of dollars into the hedge fund not once, not twice, but three times, 10 million, 5 million and then another 5 million. All told, Seabrook steered about \$20 million of the union's money to the hedge fund, including millions of dollars that were supposed to be for paying salaries and running the day-to-day operations of the union.

At the end of that first year, Seabrook cashed in. He received his first kickback from Huberfeld, \$60,000 in cash stuffed in a fancy luxury handbag, his first cash reward for betraying the union.

Folks, when you hear about bribery cases, it is easy to imagine a scene out of the movies, someone handing off a sackful of cash in some private place. Ladies and gentlemen, in this case it actually happened. The bag, the bills, the hand-off, they were all real. You'll see that it actually happened that way.

So that is why we're here today. Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld, two powerful men motivated by pure greed,

entered into a corrupt scheme. As a result, the hard working men and women of the Correction Officers Benevolent Association were left with a leader who acted for his own interests rather than theirs and who used their hard earned retirement benefits as nothing but a means to line his own pockets.

This is the government's opening statement. This is our opportunity, my opportunity to lay out a roadmap for you and give you a sense of what the evidence presented during this trial will show. To do that, we'll do that in two simple parts:

First, I am going to describe what the evidence at this trial will show happened;

Second, I will give you a sense of just how we're going to prove it. Let's talk about what the evidence will show and let's start with Seabrook.

For 20 years Seabrook was the president of COBA, the corrections officers union. He had responsibilities to those 10,000 active duty correction officers in New York City and thousands more members who had already retired. Seabrook was unlike earlier COBA presidents. He was outspoken, high profile and brash. That aggressive style helped him win gains for correction officers, gains in dealing with city and state lawmakers. Within the unit, that same style made him feared and gave him immense power.

Now, in theory most of the decisions facing the union,

including its financial decisions, were made by the union's executive board, a group of correction officers that included Seabrook. In practice, however, Seabrook wielded immense power over the board members' jobs and futures, including whether they worked in COBA's Lower Manhattan offices or returned to their regular jobs patrolling the city's jails. So Seabrook basically controlled the board, and with that control, he controlled millions of dollars of the union's money as well.

All of this made Norman Seabrook very powerful, but it didn't make him rich. Each year he collected his regular correction officer's salary and a stipend provided by the union. Seabrook wanted more money, and as you'll learn, he was not above selling out the best interests of his union members in order to get it.

Huberfeld, Murray Huberfeld, was wealthy and an influential member of his community. He had helped start the hedge fund. By 2013, although he no longer had an official position at the fund, he continued to be associated with it. Not only that, he still had his own money and his family's money tied up in the fund. So Huberfeld still had a lot invested in that hedge fund. Its performance mattered to him.

Huberfeld knew that the hedge fund's managers wanted to ensure that more money was being put into the fund by investors than being taken out of it, and he was told that that wasn't happening. Not good news.

So Huberfeld had an interest in attracting new investors, but he wanted the kinds of clients who would not only invest millions of dollars, but would be more likely to leave those millions in the fund for long periods of time.

His best bet, the hedge fund's best bet was to move away from wealthy individual clients and toward institutional clients like pensions and unions. Huberfeld, it turned out, was not above paying someone a little extra on the side if it meant getting these clients' business.

How did Seabrook and Huberfeld find each other? They were introduced by a man named Jona Rechnitz. Jona Rechnitz was a young up and coming real estate businessman. He had grown up in Los Angeles, a son of privilege. His father had been very successful in real estate, and Rechnitz moved to New York and started his own career, hungry to make his own name.

Rechnitz felt the key to success in business was to make as many connections with powerful people as possible, movers and shakers in politics, law enforcement and real estate. That way he would become known as as the sort of guy who knew how to make things happen.

So he spent thousands of dollars on vacations, fancy lunches, sports tickets and expensive gifts for police officials, and made hundreds of thousands of dollars in political contributions, and in exchange he could and did call for special help from his friends in high places.

One of those powerful friends Mr. Rechnitz had made in the city was Norman Seabrook, a high profile leader of the correction officers union. You'll learn that Rechnitz was good at making connections, putting people together who might be of use to each other, and that is exactly what he did with Seabrook and Huberfeld, who was an old family friend.

You'll hear that in late 2013, Huberfeld had told
Rechnitz his hedge fund was looking for large institutional
clients. The lightbulb went off. Rechnitz told Huberfeld he
might be able to reel-in Seabrook and his union as a client for
the fund. Huberfeld's reaction was simple: Great! get it
done!

By that time, Rechnitz had already begun shooting

Seabrook to an occasional weekend getaway. One day in December

of 2013, Rechnitz took a small group of his friends in law

enforcement, including Seabrook, to the Dominican Republic on a

private jet. Rechnitz hoped during that trip he could close

the deal.

That is exactly what happened. While they were together in the Dominican Republic, Rechnitz and Seabrook had a private conversation at their hotel. Seabrook complained that his life had been hard, that he had bills to pay. The conversation turned to the union's investments, and Seabrook complained there, too. He told Rechnitz he wasn't particularly happy with the investment advisor who helped the union decide

where to invest its money.

Rechnitz saw the opening. Rechnitz told Seabrook about the hedge fund and said he might be able to arrange for that hedge fund to pay Seabrook kickbacks if Seabrook directed union money to the fund. Seabrook was immediately interested.

Hearing that maybe some of his financial problems might be solved, he turned to Rechnitz, referred to himself in the third person, and said it is time that Norman Seabrook got paid. When they got back to the United States, Seabrook and Huberfeld reached a deal. The deal was this:

If Seabrook got COBA to invest, Seabrook would get to line his own pockets with a percentage of any profit that the hedge fund made on COBA's money at the end of the year every year for as long as the union's money stayed with the hedge fund. So the more COBA invested, the more Seabrook stood to pocket.

If it all worked out and Seabrook could convince the union to invest \$20 million, Seabrook could personally make about a hundred thousand dollars a year. In the end, Seabrook did deliver \$20 million of the union's money.

So how did Seabrook do it? He did it by directing three different tranches, layers of money to the union's hedge fund over the course the year 2014. First, in January Seabrook set the wheels in motion for an initial \$10 million investment. That money, Seabrook arranged to had the hedge fund make an

official presentation, a pitch to the union to invest money that was held in trust for union members so that when they retire, they would each get one big payout to ease their way into retirement.

In theory, the union's investment decisions with respect to that money were made by a committee of four people, Seabrook and three other members of the union's executive board. In practice, however, Seabrook knew how to control the executive board members who were all correction officers with no independent financial expertise and who all depended on Seabrook for their seats on the board.

So after the hedge fund made a presentation to the committee, Seabrook had no trouble getting the board to invest up to \$10 million in the hedge fund. Seabrook told the board that, of course, they should only invest if the union's lawyers and advisers vetted and approved of the fund. That was just lip service because when the union's lawyers sent the committee a letter that listed a number of serious concerns they had about the union investing in the hedge fund, Seabrook made sure that no other member of the committee ever saw that letter.

The other committee members didn't know that their lawyers had raised serious concerns about the investment before they agreed with Seabrook to do it. Of course, Seabrook never disclosed to the board that he was being paid a kickback by Mr. Huberfeld in order to get the union to invest. So it is no

real surprise that within a few months of reaching his corrupt deal with Huberfeld, Seabrook caused the union to invest \$10 million with the hedge fund.

But a \$10 million investment wasn't enough to get

Seabrook the amount of money he wanted in kickbacks. Remember

the more the union invested, the more Seabrook stood to make

off the profits. That led to a second payment, \$5 million just

a few months after that first \$10 million investment. It

happened like this:

Seabrook knew that the union had more money than what was in the account to pay out the retirement benefits. He knew it also had millions of dollars in the basic operating account. This was the money the union used on a day-to-day basis, the money that kept the lights on, money that came directly from the dues paid by the union's members.

A large part of that operating account was considered what is called the reserve, a pot of money on which the union could survive in case of an emergency. It wasn't money that was supposed to be invested aggressively. It was money that was supposed to be there for a rainy day.

So in June of 2014, about three months after the initial \$10 million investment into the Platinum hedge fund, Norman Seabrook did something extraordinary. Without getting anyone's permission, without even telling anyone else on the executive board, Seabrook sent \$5 million of the union's

operating account money to the hedge fund, a sum of money representing most of that reserve. Just like that, most of it was plunged into a risky hedge fund investment secretly and without proper authorization.

The only reason anyone else at the union found out was because the union's bank called the union's treasurer the next day asking for his signature on the wire transfer. That is the first two payments.

The third payment happened in June. The board's committee met again, and Seabrook worked his magic one more time, convincing them to put a third collection of money, another \$5 million in the fund. So 10 million in January, 5 million in June, and 5 million in July, \$20 million in total.

He ignored the commitment of the union's money in a hedge fund, much more than their investment advisor said made any sense, but, of course, the decision hadn't been made because it made sense for the union. The only person who had all the facts, Norman Seabrook made the investment happen because he was promised a sizeable personal payday in order to do it. So that is how Seabrook got the union's money into the hedge fund.

What happened when as the man himself put it, it was time for Norman Seabrook to get paid?

What happens when he was supposed to get his first annual bribe payment at the end of 2014? Well, for obvious

reasons, the hedge fund couldn't just cut normal Seabrook a check, so Huberfeld and Jona Rechnitz came up with a plan to cover up the bribe payment to Seabrook. Rechnitz had a share of season ticket package for the New York Nicks. These were courtside seats, each worth thousands of dollars even though the Nicks weren't very good. Rechnitz and Huberfeld pretended Rechnitz sold some of those courtside seats to the hedge fund for \$60,000 so he would use them with their clients.

Rechnitz would give 60 grand in cash to Seabrook, and then the hedge fund would reimburse Rechnitz by paying him \$60,000 for the sham Nicks tickets. Rechnitz even created a fake invoice for Nicks tickets for \$60,000 and sent it to Huberfeld.

So with that plan in place, Rechnitz arranged to pay off Seabrook on Huberfeld's behalf. On December 11th, 2014, Rechnitz was supposed to have dinner with Seabrook and some other friends in law enforcement in midtown. Rechnitz called Seabrook and asked him to meet him outside the restaurant early because he had something for him.

Rechnitz knew he was delivering the \$60,000, but he was also delivering bad news because Seabrook was expecting so much more. So he literally tried to dress it up. He went to the Salvatore Ferragamo store, a lucky store in Manhattan. He knew Ferragamo was Seabrook's favorite brand. He bought Seabrook fancy shoes from that store before.

So he went to that store and he purchased a small bag, a satchel for about \$800.00. He then went back to this office and stuffed \$60,000 in cash from his business estate into that bag. When the time came, he met Seabrook just up a block from the restaurant inside of Seabrook's car and made the hand-off. Seabrook was disappointed, but not so disappointed that he didn't take the money.

Over the next few months Huberfeld continued to try to get more money from Seabrook and COBA, but Seabrook had to slow down. For once some of his board members were putting pressure on him for what had happened with the operating account money, and he felt increased scrutiny. What's more, federal investigators visited Rechnitz and asked him questions about some of his financial dealings. Everything stopped. That was as far as things got.

About a year later, Norman Seabrook was arrested by the FBI, and they searched his house. Guess what the FBI found? Right in Seabrook's den the FBI found the Ferragamo satchel. They also found over \$23,000 in a safe elsewhere in the house along with other stacks of thousands of dollars in cash. I'll say that again, ladies and gentlemen. The FBI found the Ferragamo bag that Rechnitz had stuffed with bribe money and tens of thousands of dollars in cash in Norman Seabrook's house.

That is what the evidence is going to show, ladies and

gentlemen. Norman Seabrook agreed to betray his union for his personal enrichment, and Murray Huberfeld arranged for Seabrook to get paid for that betrayal to the tune of a bagful of cash, \$60,000. So that is what happened. That is what the evidence at this trial will show.

How are we going to prove it to you?

You are going to see a lot of evidence evidence over the course of the next couple of weeks and you're going to hear a lot of testimony. Right now I will give you a sense of the most important types of evidence you can expect to see and hear during this trial.

First, you are going to hear testimony from lots of witnesses, including from members of the union about how Seabrook manipulated the annuity, the fund committee approved its investments into the hedge fund. You will hear no one on that committee had any idea Seabrook had a relationship with the people in the hedge fund at that time, let alone that Huberfeld was bribing.

You will also hear how Seabrook concealed important information from his fellow members of the committee, like the letter from the union's lawyers that raised concerns about investing in the hedge fund.

Second, you are going to see evidence of the kickback, the bagful of cash took a short but important journey on its way so Seabrook's hands, purchased at the Ferragamo store,

brought back to Jona Rechnitz's office to be filled with cash and brought back to the restaurant before Seabrook took it home.

You'll see the evidence that allows you to track that journey. You will see the receipt from the luxury store stamped just before Seabrook and Rechnitz were supposed to get together. You will see the surveillance video showing Rechnitz going to his office after the purchase to load up the bag with cash and you will see video of him leaving with the bag to meet Norman Seabrook.

You will see police records showing that Seabrook drove into Manhattan that evening. You will see phone records showing Rechnitz called Seabrook right around the time they met in Manhattan -- sorry -- right around the time that they met in Manhattan and Rechnitz talked to Huberfeld once the deed was done.

You will see a picture of Seabrook and Rechnitz together after the dinner that evening and, yes, you will even see the bag, the Ferragamo bag that the FBI found in Seabrook's den with the exact same serial number as the bag in the receipt that Rechnitz got from the Ferragamo store. You will also see the thousands of dollars in cash that they found in Seabrook's home safe.

The third category of evidence. You will see evidence of a coverup. You will see the fake invoice for Nicks tickets

that Jona Rechnitz had his assistant drummed up right around the time when Rechnitz and Seabrook met for the payoff. You will see and hear evidence showing that the reason for reimbursement made no sense. You will see the check Murray Huberfeld and the hedge fund cut to Rechnitz again for Nicks tickets just days after Seabrook got paid.

You will even see visual evidence, footage of courtside at Madison Square Garden that shows those seats were used by Jona Rechnitz and his friends, not by Murray Huberfeld.

Fourth, you will hear recorded conversations with a judicially authorized wiretap on Rechnitz's phone. recordings began in the weeks after Seabrook was paid, but you'll hear now in early 2015 Huberfeld was still trying to get more money out of COBA, and you will see phone records showing how that regular phone contact between Rechnitz and Seabrook, what had been many calls a month slowed significantly right after Seabrook got paid and slowed even more once Rechnitz and Seabrook found themselves under scrutiny by COBA's board and from law enforcement.

(Continued on next page)

24

25

MR. BELL: Finally, ladies and gentlemen, you'll hear a detailed account of how all of this happened from Jona Rechnitz himself. Rechnitz will take the stand, and he'll tell you about how he made the scheme happen, about how he brought the defendants together for their mutual benefit and greed. He'll tell you about how this was the culmination of years of his paying and gifting his way up New York City's pathways of power.

And he'll tell you about how, on December 11th, 2014, he handed Norman Seabrook \$60,000 in a bag, and how he received a check for \$60,000 from Murray Huberfeld shortly thereafter as reimbursement. Rechnitz will tell you that he did everything he could to keep this a secret, at least for a while. He didn't tell the whole truth about any of this the first couple of times he was approached by law enforcement. He even started deleting some of his e-mails, even tried to cover up his crimes, Seabrook's crimes, Huberfeld's crimes, crimes of various people in law enforcement and city government, whose loyalty he bought.

But it's hard to stick to a lie for that long, especially in Jona Rechnitz's case, when he had so much to keep hidden and federal law enforcement had started closing in.

Eventually, law enforcement did close in and Rechnitz couldn't keep his many secrets anymore. He came clean. He pled guilty and admitted what he did, not only helping to arrange the bribe

between Seabrook and Huberfeld, but also admitting to buying the loyalty of law enforcement and politicians for years.

Rechnitz will also tell you that he is now cooperating with the government and testifying because he hopes to receive leniency at sentencing. I want to be clear about Jona Rechnitz. This is someone who committed serious crimes. Rechnitz will tell you about the gifts to cops and city officials and the favors he got and expected in return. He'll also tell you about some of the business practices he engaged in, which even when they may not have been illegal, were often shady or distasteful. Given that he managed to arrange a kickback scheme between a union leader and a hedge fund, that shouldn't surprise you.

I expect that the defense counsel will ask you to focus on and scrutinize Rechnitz, and you should. He was a wheeler and dealer, a wannabe big shot, and he broke the law in multiple ways to get ahead. You may not approve of the way he sailed through his late 20s on a wave of entitlement. You will not approve that he was willing to flout the law and arrange for payments to people like Norman Seabrook and the police to get whatever he wanted, but the question isn't going to be whether you approve of Jona Rechnitz or even whether you like him. It's whether you believe he's telling the truth.

So we ask you to listen very closely and carefully to his testimony. Compare that testimony with the other evidence

that you'll see and hear, and see if his testimony is supported by that other evidence. When you do that, you'll find that Rechnitz's testimony is backed up by everything else you will see and hear at this trial, the documents, the other witnesses, the wiretap calls, the phone records, the pictures, the video and the other evidence that you'll see. All of the evidence showing that Norman Seabrook sold the duties he owed to the hardworking men and women of the union and their retirement money for personal gain, and that Murray Huberfeld bought off Seabrook to shore up the hedge fund that he had founded and was invested in.

I mentioned before that at closing of the case we'll have the chance to talk to you again, but between now and then, I'll ask you to do just three things. First, I'll ask you to pay careful attention to the evidence and the testimony as it comes in. Second, I'll ask that you follow Judge Carter's instructions on the law. And third, I'll just ask you to use your common sense, the same common sense that's used through your lives out there in the world.

Do those three things, the defendants will get a fair trial, the government will get a fair trial, and I expect that you'll reach the only verdict consistent with the evidence you're about to see and hear, that the defendants, Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld, are guilty as charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Who's going first for defense counsel?

MR. SHECHTMAN: I am, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHECHTMAN: May it please the Court, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, good morning. My name is Paul Shechtman, and along with Maggie Lynaugh, I represent Norman Seabrook, who you've already heard a great deal about.

Ms. Lynaugh, please stand.

And helping us in this trial will be Gussie Granquist, a paralegal. Gussie, will you stand.

For 20 years, until the indictment in this case and Mr. Seabrook was suspended from duty, according to New York City law, for 20 years Mr. Seabrook was the president and is the president of the Correction Officers Benefits Association, COBA, the union that represents the men and women who worked in New York City jails, who have been rightly described this morning as people who do a hard and dangerous job. It is our privilege to represent Mr. Seabrook, who, as you will learn, has been one of the city's most effective labor leaders, one of the most effective labor leaders, I would say, in the history of this city. Mr. Seabrook, would you stand.

This case is named United States v. Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld. That's what was on the jury questionnaires that you filled out. That's what will be on the

transcript that the court reporter prepares every day, but in many ways, that gets it wrong. In reality, this case is Jona Rechnitz v. Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld. For Jona Rechnitz is the government's star witness. He was mentioned last in the opening, but he's first.

In many ways, as you will see, he's the government's only real witness. He's the only witness who says there was cash, \$60,000, in the Ferragamo bag that he gave to Mr. Seabrook on December 11th, 2014. He is the only witness who says that Mr. Huberfeld bribed Mr. Seabrook. At bottom, this is a one-witness case, and the one witness is Jona Rechnitz. When this case is over, when you learn about Jona Rechnitz, what you will know is that Jona Rechnitz is a liar, a serial liar, a pathological liar. You'll learn that he lies about the smallest things and about the biggest things. Most importantly, you'll learn that Jona is lying about Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld.

Let me give you a few examples of the lies that you'll learn about. Let me start with October of 2013, first example. In October of 2013, Jona befriended Norman Seabrook --

THE COURT: Just a second. Just try to stay closer to the microphone there, counsel.

MR. SHECHTMAN: I'm going to move the microphone.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHECHTMAN: First lie, first example. In October

of 2013, Jona began to befriend Norman Seabrook to try to win him over, to ingratiate himself with Mr. Seabrook, to buy him gifts, to take him on trips.

And what you'll learn is that Jona soon learned that Mr. Seabrook's office, the COBA's office, was at 75 Broad Street, downtown. And so Jona sent Mr. Seabrook an e-mail that said the following -- let me make sure I get this right -- the e-mail said: I own 23 Wall Street and I used to own 25 Broad Street. I own 23 Wall Street and I used to own 25 Broad Street. And what you're going to learn is he didn't own either building. He never owned either building.

All right? He owned those buildings as much as you and I own those buildings. No ownership interest at all. Now, he did manage 20 -- let's get this right. He did manage 23 Wall Street? His company did, but that management agreement was terminated one week before he wrote that e-mail that said he owned those buildings. Okay? And that is pure Jona Rechnitz. All right? Take a tiny little piece of truth, I managed those buildings, I managed them until last week when I was fired, and turn it into a lie, I own those buildings. That's the first example of the Jona Rechnitz, who's the government's star witness.

Let me give you a second example. This one is from the summer of 2014, July of 2014, and by then Jona was continuing to try to win over Mr. Seabrook, to try to befriend

him, to try to say, as Jona always said: You're my best friend; so happy I know you.

And so he said to Mr. Seabrook, come out, bring your family, take a ride on my yacht. It's docked over on the pier on the west side. Take a ride with your family on my yacht, and Mr. Seabrook did. He brought his family. 7:00 to 10:00 they rode on the yacht, except it wasn't Mr. Rechnitz's yacht. He didn't own it. He rented it for the evening, and here is the direction that was given to the crew. The directions said this: Very important to have no personal photos, items or indications that the boat is rented. Staff is to act as if Jona Rechnitz owns the boat.

All right? Don't let Mr. Seabrook know it's a rental. Staff is to act as if Mr. Rechnitz owns the boat, just like he owned the building that he didn't own. And why? That's the second thing that's pure Jona. I said the first thing was take a kernel of truth and expand it, expand it into a bag of popcorn, expand it into a complete lie. The second thing about him is lie to make yourself bigger than you are, lie to make yourself more important than you are, lie to say that the boat you're renting for the evening is the boat you own.

Third example. Third example is in November 2014. In November 2014, Jona Rechnitz applied for a gun license. He wanted to own a handgun, and you'll see that application.

Every sentence in that application is false, but it begins with

the following, occupation. All right? Occupation, diamond company manager. False. Not true. Why? Well, we'll ask him, but I presume the answer is it's hard to get a license if you say I'm in the real estate business. It's easier to get a license if you say I'm in the diamond business, I own diamonds, I carry diamonds, I move diamonds. So Jona lied.

You're going to see the form at the bottom of it that says, false statements on this form are a crime. So he lied.

And you're going to hear that he's got immunity for that lie, as he does for so many other things because he's testifying in this case.

Now, if you look at that license application again, if you continue, there's a part of it that says this, there's a part of it that says, if you apply for a license in the City of New York, your application is a public record. You and I and the reporters should know who's applying for gun licenses in this city. But there's some exceptions; so check the box if you fit any of the exceptions. Check the box if you fit any of the exemptions. And Jona checked the box.

Why should his application be confidential? Because he was a chaplain in the Westchester County Police. Okay? Well, sort of. You're going to hear that he paid tens of thousands of dollars to the Westchester County executive to get his chaplaincy. You're going to hear that he never performed any services, he never went to any meetings, he never counseled

any members. He was truly a no-show spiritual advisor.

Why did he put chaplaincy on that form? I suppose the answer is, we'll ask him, it's easier to get a confidential application through if you can say you're connected to law enforcement, and so he did. He was a phony chaplain, and it is, through and through, a phony application.

Now, that, ladies and gentlemen, is the tip of a very large iceberg. Those are three examples, and you're going to hear literally scores more. Jona Rechnitz and the truth have never been in the same room, and this will not be the first room. There's more that could give you a taste of Jona Rechnitz. Mr. Bell said he went through his 30s, I think his expression was, it was an elegant expression, a wave of entitlement.

You're going to hear that Jona Rechnitz went through his 30s and 20s on a wave of lies and the biggest lie is the one that he told that brings us to this courtroom. So I urge you, as you hear the evidence in this case, keep your eye on the ball. The government may well argue, Jona may well tell you, that he has a history of lying but he's suddenly reformed. He is now a truth teller because he signed an agreement with the government to tell the truth. He's changed his stripes.

But the evidence will show that in May 2016, when Jona first approached the government with his story about Mr. Seabrook and Mr. Huberfeld, when he first approached the

government, he was desperate. And you're going to hear a little piece of tape, or Jona will tell you about a little piece of tape, where he says: Desperate people do desperate things, and that's what happened.

Jona's world was collapsing around him. Jona knew that the government was on to him. He knew that he was likely to be indicted for corrupting police officers, showering them with gifts in return for benefits for himself and his friends, benefits like, get this one, benefits like having a lane in the Lincoln Tunnel shut down so that he and his friends could get in the city faster from their private jets.

He knew that he was likely to be indicted for that, and he knew that he was likely to be indicted for defrauding investors for putting money into a Ponzi scheme, a Ponzi scheme in which he made hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not more. And the person he called his best friend, a person named Moshe Weinberger lost millions.

Above all, Jona knew the government was on to him and he was facing a lengthy prison sentence, and so Jona came to the government with his lawyers and sought leniency. If you give me a sweetheart deal, I will give you two men, Norman Seabrook, a powerful union leader; Murray Huberfeld, a powerful and successful business leader. And Jona made up a story about them. He got his sweetheart deal. He got it by doing what he does so well, what he's done for a living, he lied.

And as I said, it's Jona Rechnitz's false story, his lie, his sweetheart deal that brings us together today. So keep your eye on the ball. The government will argue that Jona's story is corroborated. You've already heard some of that this morning, but the proof will show that the corroboration doesn't actually corroborate anything that matters. At the end of the day, at the end of this case, this is all about Jona's word.

When I was a young lawyer, a young trial lawyer, I was told a story, and it was a story about what was called palm tree corroboration. As I heard the story, it went like this: A man walked into a police station in Florida, in Miami, and he says to the police officer, a terrible crime, the governor just assaulted me under a palm tree. And the police officer says, sir, that's a very serious accusation, that's a very serious charge. Do you have anything to corroborate that? Do you have anything to support that? And the man said, I do, I do. Come with me. And he walked the police officer down the street and he pointed up and he said, there's the palm tree. That's what supports it. All right? Which is to say nothing supported it.

The corroboration in this case, what backs up Jona's word in this case is just that, it is pure palm tree corroboration. All right? The Knicks tickets, the Ferragamo bag, the photographs, the money found in Mr. Seabrook's house, 19 months after this alleged bribe. It will all prove

irrelevant as corroboration when you look at it closely, when you exercise your common sense. It's all like the palm tree in that old story, it proves nothing.

Let me be more specific with you. You will hear that on December 11th, 2014, Jona Rechnitz bought a Ferragamo bag for Mr. Seabrook. He bought it as a present for Mr. Seabrook, whom he was working so hard to befriend, to cultivate. You will learn that Mr. Seabrook drove into Manhattan from his home in the Bronx. There were telephone calls between the two men. You'll learn that Jona gave Mr. Seabrook the bag and that Jona and Mr. Seabrook went, with Mr. Banks, Phillip Banks, a deputy police commissioner, who they were close with, they went with Mr. Banks to a synagogue for a service and to dinner at a restaurant.

All of that is true. None of it is disputed. But the prosecutors will show you a receipt for the bag. They will show you photographs of Mr. Seabrook's car driving into the city through a toll booth on the Triborough Bridge. They will show you photographs of Jona with Mr. Seabrook and Mr. Banks at the synagogue. They will even show you a picture of the restaurant. They will spend days proving what is not in dispute. They will spend days proving everything but what matters. What matters in this case is this, was there \$60,000 in that bag? And for that, there's only the word of Jona

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rechnitz.

2 Ladies and gentlemen, you'll also learn this, Norman 3 Seabrook was a powerful union leader in this city. He ran COBA with a strong hand. He ran it for 20 years. He won the 4 5 confidence of his members because he won them benefits. He could scream to get his way, and he could charm to get his way. 6 7 He could cajole to get his way. His way was to improve the lives of his members. When he started in 1985 as a correction 8 9 officer, correction officers were second-class citizens in this 10 city. Police and firemen earned far more. Wins at the 11 bargaining table and at the legislature, wins that Mr. Seabrook 12 won gained correction officers respect and equality. 13 Correction officers grew in strength because Norman Seabrook 14 had their back.

Mr. Seabrook came to know Jona Rechnitz through

Phillip Banks, that very senior police official. Norman

thought Jona was a billionaire. Jona owned buildings, at least

he said he did; he owned a yacht, or at least he said he did;

he flew private jets; and he owned or he had a partial

ownership in a hedge fund, Platinum Partners, or at least he

said he did.

Mr. Seabrook was not happy with the performance of the investments that his annuity fund was making, and you're going to learn he was not happy for good reason. He thought the returns could be higher, and he asked the annuity fund, an

independent investment advisor, Thomas Reynolds, to check out Platinum Partners. You will hear from Mr. Reynolds during the course of this trial. He will tell you that Platinum Partners checked out, that it was highly rated, that it consistently had excellent returns, that its returns over a lengthy period averaged 18 percent.

Your bank account, my bank account doesn't earn 18 percent, and so with Mr. Reynolds' blessing, the COBA annuity fund invested in Platinum, first, \$10 million in March 2014 and then \$5 million in August 2014. Again, with Mr. Reynolds' approval. The investment was not made because anyone was bribed. The investment was made because Platinum checked out, because its returns were excellent.

Jona had impressed Mr. Seabrook as a supposed billionaire, and his fund or the fund he claimed to have an ownership interest in, Platinum Partners, had impressed Mr. Reynolds. That is what this case is about. That is what the proof will show.

When this case is over, you would not buy a used car from Jona Rechnitz. Don't buy what he's selling in this courtroom. Don't buy his lies. The proof will show that Norman Seabrook is innocent of these charges. The proof will show that Murray Huberfeld is innocent of these charges.

When all the evidence is in, when this case comes to a conclusion, maybe as early as next week, when all the evidence

HAOPSEA2

is in, you're going to learn that in United States v. Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld, in what might be better described as Jona Rechnitz v. Norman Seabrook and Murray Huberfeld, in this case, Jona Rechnitz's word is worthless. It thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel?

MR. SHECHTMAN: Judge, could we just have a one-minute bathroom break?

THE COURT: Sure. Let's do this. Let's go ahead and just take a six-minute break, and we'll be right back. Okay?

Again, don't discuss the case with anyone else. Don't discuss it amongst yourselves.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Okay. Are we ready? Let's bring the jury back in.

MR. BELL: Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BELL: Just to note, the microphone back there still does not work for some reason, which will effect all of our lives once we start with witnesses.

THE COURT: Okay. Wait, wait. We know it's not working now?

MR. BELL: This one is working, but that one is not working.

THE COURT: Instead of bringing the jury back in here

HAOPSEA2

and bringing them back out, let me just tell Tara to hold off on the jurors for a second. Let's get IT up here.

MR. MAZUREK: Like icing the kicker.

MR. SHECHTMAN: Your Honor, can I --

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. SHECHTMAN: Are we still going to take an 11:30 morning break?

THE COURT: I think we're going to need to take that closer to noon, depending on when they get here; so probably noon to 12:30.

MR. SHECHTMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: So, counsel, let me get a sense, how long is your opening statement going to be?

MR. MAZUREK: About 30 minutes.

THE COURT: So what's going to happen is IT has informed us before that once the opening statements — due to whatever technical glitches there are, once we're finished with opening statements, that mic is going to die and they can make that other mic come alive. So we'll have them up here in 30 minutes; so that shouldn't be a problem. There shouldn't be any interruption of flow. We'll have the witness start testifying, we'll take a break at noon. Let my deputy make that call, and we'll get the jury out, and we'll go on with defense counsel's opening statements.

MR. MAZUREK: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: The other thing, on the record, counsel, something else I've just been informed of. We can deal with this later, after the break. My deputy has just informed me that juror No. 1, the juror who was late today, was late because his mother was hit by a car yesterday, and he needs —

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Correction, not his mother. The home health aide that takes care of his mother was hit by a car yesterday; so he needs to make some other arrangements. We can bring him out later and make an inquiry of him and the like.

Counsel, having talked about that now, I know you're in the middle of making your opening statement. We can deal with that at the break. At 12:00 we can talk about that. But the home health aide that takes care of his mother was hit by a car, and he may need to make some other arrangements. Okay? Let's bring the jury in.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. Go ahead, counsel.

MR. MAZUREK: Thank you, Judge. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This is the last speech you'll have to hear for the day and, hopefully, I read somewhere the last shall be first; so we'll see how it goes.

Ladies and gentlemen, about an hour ago, Mr. Bell walked this way, towards my client, pointed his finger at him.

He said, this man promised to bribe Norman Seabrook. Now, look, I get it. This is a criminal trial. We each have our roles in this case, right? The Judge presides over the matter. The prosecutors, they point fingers, and the defense lawyers, we're the voice of our clients. But think about this, ladies and gentlemen, is that the first impression that you would want of someone who you cared about? I dare say it wouldn't be.

Now, why is Mr. Huberfeld sitting in this courtroom having his finger pointed at him? Because he did business with Jona Rechnitz. What will the evidence show in this case? That's what's important. It's not important what I say, what Mr. Bell says, or what Mr. Shechtman says, but what the evidence will show. And over the next two weeks or so, you're going to have a chance to hear from different witnesses, look at many documents and study the facts.

All we're here to do right now is to give you a roadmap of things that you should expect to hear from that witness stand in the far corner of this courtroom. When Mr. Bell stands up and says my client, Mr. Huberfeld, promised to bribe, what will the evidence show? What will the evidence show who Mr. Huberfeld actually is? You're going to hear from his former partner, Gilad Kalter, maybe as early as today, who was an officer at the hedge fund that my client worked.

And, yes, you're going to hear from Jona Rechnitz. You've heard a lot of things about him. I still have a few

more things to add before you get to see him later this week, but what will the evidence show of Mr. Huberfeld? Well, it will show who he really is, a 57-year-old man, grew up in Brooklyn, immigrant family. You'll hear from Jona Rechnitz how he got to know Mr. Huberfeld, because Jona Rechnitz's grandfather and Mr. Huberfeld's father were from the same part of Poland and survived the Holocaust. They immigrated to Brooklyn, and you will hear that they started small businesses, were entrepreneurs right here in New York City.

You will hear that Mr. Huberfeld went to Brooklyn College, but he always worked. Here's the contrast I want you to keep your eye on, ladies and gentlemen. In this case, Jona Rechnitz, son of a fancy real estate owner from Beverly Hills, running around gambling, private jets, fancy trips, sitting next to Spike Lee at the Madison Square Garden during Knicks games and Murray Huberfeld.

What are you going to hear about Murray Huberfeld?

During college, he opened -- helped with his father to open a kosher fast food chain. It was called Kosher Delight in Flatbush, Brooklyn, and, ladies and gentlemen, Jona Rechnitz will tell you all about that. That's how Murray Huberfeld got his start. He opened a fast food chain and was behind the counter working, working.

And from there, yeah, guess what? The evidence will show Murray Huberfeld became a great success, a great success.

He built capital in his fast food chain, this Kosher Delight, these small restaurants. He got to know people in his community, and he said, you know what, I think I have a knack for investment, and he founded an investment fund with people who helped his family build the capital to open these stores.

In about 2003, the evidence will show, Murray
Huberfeld and his partners founded a hedge fund, a hedge fund
called Platinum Partners. That's what the evidence will show.

Now, let me say something about what a hedge fund is. You're
going to hear evidence about it, but just so that you can
understand the way the story progresses here in this case. A
hedge fund, ladies and gentlemen, is just a fancy way of saying
that a group of people or entities get together and agree to
allow other people, the managers of the fund, to find the best
investments for their money.

And that's what Murray Huberfeld did. He was someone who said, I'm going to go out, find the best investments, scour the four corners of the earth and find the best places for people to earn money on their investments. Those investments could be in anything, stocks, bonds, loans, commodities like oil or gas, or investments in other companies. A hedge fund, don't be scared by the term and turned off by it, it's just a place where people pool their money and have other people manage it and make other investments.

Now, Murray Huberfeld and his partners, you will hear,

started with a modest set of investment money in 2003, pooled it together, sought money from other people in their community, and ten years later, ten years later, in 2013, around the time when the events that the government are going to put in front of you in this case, it was a gigantic fund. Murray Huberfeld was a success, is a success.

You're going to hear evidence, maybe even later today, that that fund, Platinum Partners, was started on the shoulders of Kosher Delight capital, has about — had about a billion dollars, that's with a B, in assets under management by the time that Jona Rechnitz introduced Murray Huberfeld to Norman Seabrook. Now, to put that into perspective, ladies and gentlemen, the amount that the government is saying are part of the reason for the \$60,000 bribe, which is the only issue in this whole case, that COBA investment that Mr. Bell spoke about earlier this morning, were \$20 million.

Now, I will confess something to you, that throughout this trial there's going to be a lot of numbers, and I apologize in advance because I went to law school because I'm not good at math. But I can tell you that \$20 million, the amount of the COBA investment, which is the motivation that the government claims is the reason that my client suddenly took to a life of crime and committed a bribe, \$20 million out of one billion dollars, with a B. That's a small percentage, a very small percentage.

Now, you're going to hear about this fund and hear a little bit about it from the other lawyers, but it's a multi-strategy fund. It had investments both in the credit portion of the funds, with loans that it extended to people or entities, mostly companies. It invested in companies. It had an international base. It was a very large investment fund, ladies and gentlemen. It was not something that, for the spur of the moment, that Mr. Huberfeld suddenly needed \$20 million to make this fund something that it already had grown over the ten years. That didn't happen.

The evidence will show that Murray Huberfeld did not promise to bribe Norman Seabrook to get this one investment ten years into the creation of the fund that already succeeded. It makes no sense.

Now, let me tell you what else the evidence is going to show you about my client, Murray. Murray didn't take this success that he achieved lightly. As I said, it took him ten years to build up this fund to where it was in 2013, and you will hear that he is, and I know this for a fact, an incredibly driven person who works 24/6. I said 24/6 because

Mr. Huberfeld observes the Sabbath. It's the one time that he doesn't work.

He is a type A personality, who gives his all to every project. And how are you going to understand that in this case? Well, in this case, you're going to hear from Murray

Huberfeld because, as the government said, during the early months of 2015, the government was thankfully investigating a real criminal called Jona Rechnitz, and they had secret wiretaps up on Jona Rechnitz's phone. So when Mr. Huberfeld called Jona Rechnitz to ask Mr. Rechnitz to do his brokerage work or promotion of the fund, you get to hear from Mr. Huberfeld.

And what are you going to hear? You're not going to hear, oh, Jona, pay cash to Norman Seabrook or, oh, Jona or Jeremy, his partner, why didn't you pay Norman more money so we can get more money into the Platinum fund, or hey, Jona, why did you underpay Norman Seabrook because now he's angry and I'm not putting more money into the fund. That's what the government claims, but you're not going to hear that.

What are you going to hear? I'll tell you what you're going to hear, a very pushy guy from Brooklyn screaming at a broker, saying, get more gelt into my fund. Gelt, you'll hear, is a Yiddish term for money, and he's going to be pushy and he's going to be, let's close the deal. He's going to be, what's going on? Get an update. I don't care that you're in Los Angeles. Get over here and get the deal done. There's more money to be done in COBA.

And the government wants you to believe that's a crime. They want you to believe that's bribery, but that's Murray Huberfeld doing his job, the same job he had been doing

for ten years. He wasn't saying stuff money in a bag. He was saying, Jona Rechnitz, do the things that you're supposed to do. You're the million dollar broker, get it done.

Ladies and gentlemen, the only reason that Murray

Huberfeld is sitting in this courtroom, you're going to hear

through the course of the evidence in this trial, is because of

Jona Rechnitz. That's it.

You've heard a little bit about Jona Rechnitz, but he's a broker. That's what the evidence will show. He's a middleman, a matchmaker. He's cupid for business people. He puts one person together with another. Murray Huberfeld, looking for investments, looking for investors, big, because there's a billion dollar fund. Jona Rechnitz, who is this guy? It's really going to be hard for you to believe by the end of this trial that this guy did the things he did.

He was, as Mr. Bell calls him, the man about town.

Jona Rechnitz, you're going to hear, came to New York City from his flashy Beverly Hills neighborhood and came to New York and said, you know what, I'm going to be a business tycoon. I'm going to be one of the most important people that everybody is going to want to know in New York City. Now, he had, you're going to hear, a pretty wealthy daddy, and he had some charisma because the things that he got to do were quite literally spectacular.

He had some money as a base because of his father and

his father's real estate developments, but he got to know people and he got to spend a lot of money. Ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear that he spent more money on Knicks tickets than he paid in taxes. Ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear that he took private jets, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars a year on private jets to Las Vegas, Miami, Dominican Republic, London, Israel.

And who does he talk to? He talks to -- let me ask you this. How many of us get the opportunity, get the opportunity every time we want to leave our job and our office in Manhattan, got to go home, some of us take the subway, some of us Metro-North, some, unfortunately like myself, New Jersey Transit, but Jona Rechnitz, he gets to call -- get this, you're going to hear this in the testimony -- the New York City Chief of Police, the highest uniformed officer in New York, a guy by the name of Phil Banks. And when he's ready to go home, hey, Phil, come pick me up. And he gets to be driven home with lights and sirens in a police cruiser by the chief of police.

Guess who he calls on the cell phone when he has an idea to run the city? Hmm. You know, you and me, maybe we have some ideas that we talk about over coffee with our friends, but Jona Rechnitz, you'll hear, he calls a fellow by the name of Bill de Blasio on his personal cell phone, and he gets an answer. You'll hear Mayor de Blasio's personal e-mail address that he flaunts around to his investor friends and

said, this is my bud, Bill. This guy was barely 30 years old. It's hard to believe, but you're going to hear it right from that witness stand.

Now, this is the guy who presents it to my client,

Murray Huberfeld, and as I said, Huberfeld's family and the

Rechnitzes came from the same Orthodox Jewish community. And

actually, Murray's parents were from the same part of Poland as

Jona's family originally; so they knew of each other. They

were in the same type of circles.

So Mr. Huberfeld, you'll hear, heard about
Mr. Rechnitz and Jona's incredible rise to a big position here
in New York City, to somebody, as they say in that neighborhood
in the upper west side, a big macher or bigshot. And what does
a broker, ladies and gentlemen, sell? A broker sells
connections.

You heard Mr. Shechtman, Jona Rechnitz said, I own this building, I own that building, I own a yacht. He didn't own any of that. The only assets Jona Rechnitz had, ladies and gentlemen, was that address book, that phone number of Mayor de Blasio, the ability to take Chief of Police Banks around in a cruiser, the ability, as Mr. Shechtman told you, again hard to believe but you're here in this case, to close down a lane in the Lincoln Tunnel for a business associate.

Now, I'm not a big fan of reality TV, but I know there's a show on one of these channels called Million Dollar

Listing, and it's about a fancy broker who gets people tied up
to big fancy properties. Jona Rechnitz was the real life

Million Dollar Broker. If you owned an investment fund, ladies
and gentlemen, or a part owner, like Murray Huberfeld, and you
heard that this is the guy who's running around town, who has

the connections that are just too fantastic to believe,

wouldn't you hire him?

That's what Platinum Partners and Murray Huberfeld did, said, Jona, I think we have an idea. And you're going to hear testimony that Jona said, I have a list, I have a list. What broker doesn't have a list? 25 entities, unions, city, state pension funds. He's got the list, and he wants to sell it to Murray Huberfeld and Platinum. He can bring institutional investors, and you're going to hear evidence that institutional investors are important to a fund. Of course they are. They have a lot of money, the pension fund or city and state funds, or labor union funds.

And here's a guy, ladies and gentlemen, that the evidence will show, was running around with the top labor and City Hall officials in New York City. That's what Jona Rechnitz sold to Murray Huberfeld. He didn't sell a bribe. He didn't come to Murray Huberfeld and say, oh, I'm, you know, a rising star and I have all these connections, but I can't get the deal done; so can you bribe Norman Seabrook. No.

He's going to tell you that, but I'll tell you why

he's going to tell you why he's going to say that in a second, because he's in a heap full of trouble. All the evidence will show, ladies and gentlemen, is that Murray Huberfeld knew of, heard of and most people in the Orthodox Jewish community at this time in 2013, knew who Jona Rechnitz was, because he was this guy who was out there everywhere.

You're going to hear evidence that -- I hear there's something called Page Six in the New York Post, and you're going to hear evidence that Jona Rechnitz had a speed dial line to that reporter on the New York Post on Page Six that every time that he was on that floor of the Madison Square Garden during a Knicks game, it could be reported. Here is Jona Rechnitz sitting next to Stewart Rahr, pharmaceutical billionaire. You will hear that they put a bet together on the game for \$100,000 to give to charity. Jona Rechnitz was all over, and that's what he sells and he sold to my client.

Now, unfortunately, the reality is you're going to hear that Jona Rechnitz was no ordinary broker. You heard that already. He wasn't. I mean, it's crazy. He spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on entertainment, hundreds of thousands of dollars. His Amex bill was a million dollars a year. Now, when he came to Murray Huberfeld and said, I can get you these lists of people, that's all the evidence is going to show happened.

I'm going to take you through what you expect to see

on the evidence that's not -- let's put Jona Rechnitz's testimony aside. What is the evidence that's going to be presented to you? You're going to hear evidence that Jona Rechnitz wooed people like Norman Seabrook, that he gave Norman Seabrook trips and invited him out. And you know what, that's not Mr. Seabrook's fault. What's wrong with that?

Here is a guy saying, come on, I want to show you around town and I have great connections. And, you know what, Mr. Seabrook, you're an important labor leader, and Mr. Seabrook is an important labor leader, and it's good for the labor union to sit with the Chief of Police Phil Banks. What's wrong with that? That's what the evidence is going to show what Jona Rechnitz did.

Second, you're going to hear Jona Rechnitz promoted Platinum Partners, the hedge fund. Of course he did because that's how he gets paid. He gets paid on commissions.

(Continued on next page)

25

Right? And he also sells his credibility, so you know what you get on this case? The government says my client promised to pay Norman Seabrook because he is a partner at Platinum Partners. You know what Jona Rechnitz is going to testify he told Norman Seabrook? He told him he was the partner, he was the partner of Platinum Partners, he was part owner of Platinum Partners. He didn't even tell Murray Huberfeld because Jona Rechnitz said hey, I'm the man. I've got this hedge fund, it's going great, 18 percent annual returns. He sold it to Norman Seabrook. That is what you're going to hear the evidence to be. He will admit that.

Now, you're also going to hear that Jona Rechnitz then told Murray Huberfeld that Norman Seabrook has an interest in Platinum Partners, for COBA for the union, for the union money. Would you be interested?

And Murray Huberfeld said great job, Jona, this is exactly the kind of investor we are looking for. So you're going to hear that on January 13th, 2014, as a result of the match that was made by Jona Rechnitz of Norman Seabrook to Platinum Partners, that there was a board meeting, a board of the Correction Officers Benevolent Association, a board meeting on January 13, 2014, including a fellow by the name of Gilad Kalter, who will testify today or tomorrow from Platinum Partners, who was the chief operating officer at the time of one of the Platinum funds along with two or three other

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

representatives of Platinum.

They did a presentation. They showed financial They showed a history of the fund, what kind of documents. investments they made, how liquid the fund is, what they can offer to the COBA board, and it was a presentation of the entire board, and they were not the only investing fund that was presented to the board on that day. There were others.

After that board meeting, you're going to hear that the Platinum lawyers got in touch with the COBA lawyers and you're going to hear that those lawyers negotiated terms for potential investments of COBA into Platinum. You're going to hear COBA negotiated a side letter agreement which made the terms better than the normal subscriber of Platinum. special consideration to the fact that COBA was a pension fund, so it gave them better deals than the normal investor that Platinum had.

Then you'll hear the board voted, that the annuity funds invested \$15 million in the general fund, 5 million in the way Mr. Bell told you, and you're going to hear that Platinum Partners agreed to pay Jona Rechnitz a hundred thousand dollars for connecting them to COBA, Platinum to COBA.

Murray Huberfeld at the request of Platinum, you will hear Platinum issued the checks and they issued checks for reimbursement of expenses that Jona had in doing his work for the fund and he also, Jona asked for charity checks to be made

4 5

in his name because you're going to hear what is how Jona operated. He would throw around a lot of checks to charity, four checks totaling about a hundred thousand dollars.

He got paid. Jona Rechnitz got paid by Platinum

Partners, and that is what the evidence will show. No other

evidence in this case other than the testimony of Jona Rechnitz

will say that oh, Murray Huberfeld directed a bribe, I was told

to bribe Norman Seabrook by Huberfeld. Only Jona Rechnitz.

The objective, independent evidence in this case will show what

actually happened was Murray found and a successful broker,

million dollar broker, brought him to promote Platinum, and

Jona Rechnitz brought COBA as he was bringing or seeking to

bring other pension funds and savings funds into the

investment, into the investment fund. That is all.

That is, ladies and gentlemen, what the non-Jona Rechnitz will show in this case. There was no \$60,000 payment that my client had anything to do with to Norman Seabrook. It just isn't there except in the lies of Jona Rechnitz.

Why is Jona Rechnitz coming in here and lying to you? It is quite simple. He committed a lot of crimes. He committed a lot of crimes in this torrid of facts-case lifestyle of his late 20's. You're going to hear he was involved in two investment deals, two investment deals, one with a liquor distributor in Harlem and one in a ticket broker who resells various expensive sports tickets which Jona would

spend millions of dollars on.

He would find investors to invest in these two businesses. Joan Rechnitz will come in here and basically tell you, ah, you know what? I am the most unlucky person in the world. These two investment deals that I put together, the liquor business, Peralta liquor business and Nissen ticket business, they just so happened to be both complete frauds, I didn't know. I didn't know. I brought all these investors in, my good friend, best friend, Michael Weinberger, I had him put

millions of dollars in this. I didn't know.

You will evaluate that testimony, how unlucky he was to have two investment deals in this whole business and they both end of being Ponzi schemes. What are the chances of that? That is Jona Rechnitz. He had a slight problem talking about millions of dollars of losses in both of those investment deals, and you'll hear he was bad in paying taxes because everything that he did was an expense and so he didn't have any income.

You will hear he had those problems, too, and he had the problems that, you know, with the Police Department that he wanted a gun, of course, why wouldn't you want a gun to carry around New York City. So he had to bribe people to get a gun, or he wanted to be chaplain in Westchester County, so he had to bribe the Westchester County Executive to get that chaplain seat.

He committed health care fraud because he had somebody else pay for his health care. The list goes on and on. So Jona Rechnitz went in 2015, you're going to hear he starts being visited by police officers investigating him, he had a problem. He had to work out this problem because otherwise, you're going to hear he was facing many years in prison, many years in prison. So what he did was he hired some fancy lawyers, and they walked into the U.S. Attorney's Office and they worked out a deal. They worked out a deal.

You're going to hear about this deal. It is a very important piece of paper in Mr. Rechnitz's life, you're going to hear, because that piece of paper has the possibility, the difference between Joan Rechnitz going home to his five kids every night or going home to a jail cell by himself for several years.

Pretty powerful stuff, pretty tempting stuff. You're going to hear he has a cooperation agreement with the government that if the government believes he completely and truthfully discloses all information he knows about other people that can advance a criminal investigation, then the government will write a letter. You will hear about that letter in court. It is called a 5K1 letter, and that letter is the Joan Rechnitz get out-of-jail-free card. If the government writes it, seeking leniency at Joan Rechnitz's sentencing, he might go home. Otherwise, he goes to prison. Think of that,

ladies and gentlemen, what a powerful motivator to lie.

Now, the thing is, Joan Rechnitz, you will hear,

didn't need powerful motivators to lie to the government. He lies to everybody. You are going to hear he lied to hedge fund operators, to his best friend Michael Weinberger who lost millions of dollars in two different Ponzi schemes. He lied to his own father-in-law, David Kahn, put him in a bad investment deal just so he could get a commission.

He lied to our good mayor, Bill DiBlasio, about what

Jona would do for the mayor. He lied to lenders, banks and

little people relying on Jona to tell the truth about financial

documents. He lied to borrowers who trusted that he told them

the truth about his own investments.

He lied to Norman Seabrook, whom he told he was an owner of Platinum Partners, and he lied to my client, Murray Huberfeld, who he told that he legitimately promoted Platinum Partners as a real broker. Now in a few days he will lie to you to convict my client of a felony crime.

Ladies and gentlemen, don't, don't be another victim of Jona Rechnitz. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Off-the-record discussion)

THE COURT: Let's have the government call your first witness.

MR. BELL: Your Honor, the government calls Elias

HAOJSEA3 Husamudeen - direct

1 Husamudeen. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 ELIAS HUSAMUDEEN, 4 called as a witness by the Government, 5 having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 6 THE COURT: Before you start, give us a Testing 1, 2, 7 3, to make sure that mike is live. 8 MR. BELL: Testing 1, 2, 3. 9 THE COURT: Keep your voice up. 10 MR. BELL: Very well, sir. 11 THE COURT: Now again, counsel, keep your voice up. 12 For the witness, the acoustics aren't great. Lean into the 13 microphone and give us a Testing 1, 2, 3. 14 THE WITNESS: Testing 1, 2, 3. 15 THE COURT: Are the jurors able to hear the witness 16 okay. 17 THE JURY: Yes. 18 MR. BELL: I have just been provided a microphone, 19 Testing 1, 2, 3. 20 (Pause) 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 BY MR. BELL: Good morning, Mr. Husamudeen. 23 0. 24 Α. Good morning.

Where were you born, sir?

25

- 1 A. Charleston, South Carolina.
- 2 Q. Where do you live now?
- 3 A. Staten Island, New York.
- 4 | Q. Are you testifying today pursuant to a subpoena?
- 5 A. Yes, I am.
- 6 Q. What job or jobs do you currently have?
- A. I am currently a New York City correction officer and I am also the president of the correction officers union known as
- 9 COBA.
- 10 | Q. I want to ask you a few things about each of those jobs.
- 11 First of all, Mr. Husamudeen, what is a correction
- 12 officer?
- A. New York City correction officers are responsible, someone who is hired and responsible for care, custody and control of
- 15 | inmates and detainees in the New York City jail system.
- Q. Where generally do New York City's correction officers
- 17 | work?
- 18 A. We generally work in the 13 or 14 jails throughout New York
- 19 City. At least 9 or 10 of them are located on Rikers Island.
- 20 | Q. What duties and responsibilities do corrections officers
- 21 have as part of the care, custody and control that you
- 22 mentioned a moment ago?
- 23 A. Well, our duties are numerous, but we are responsible for
- 24 ensuring that inmates don't leave the custody of the New York
- 25 City jail system. We are responsible for ensuring that they

- get the services that they're entitled to as inmates, such as 1 whether it is mental health treatment, being able to receive 2
- 3
- visits and things from their family, things of that nature.
- Is it a challenging job? 4 Q.
- I think it is the most challenging job in the world. 5
- Why is that? 6 Q.
- 7 Well, basically we're responsible for working with people
- that most people don't want to work with or don't want in the 8
- 9 community.
- 10 Is it a dangerous job?
- 11 Α. Yes, it is.
- 12 Ο. How so?
- 13 Well, because again we're working with people who are Α.
- 14 arrested for assaults, for murder, for rape, for violent
- 15 crimes, and for 24 hours a day seven days a week we are there
- with them, working with them in the same vicinity with them. 16
- 17 Q. You also mentioned that you're the president of the
- Correction Officers Benevolent Association. What is the 18
- Correction Officers Benevolent Association? 19
- 20 The Correction Officers Benevolent Association is the union
- 21 that represents correction officers, active and retired, in New
- 22 York City.
- 23 I believe you mentioned it is known as COBA, for short?
- 24 Α. Yes.

How long have you been the president of COBA?

2

7

9

- Approximately 15 months, 16 months. Α.
- Did you have other jobs with COBA prior to that? Q.
- 3 Yes. Prior to holding this position, I held the position
- 4 as first vice president of the union, and I've held the
- 5 position as treasurer of the Correction Officers Benevolent
- 6 Association.
 - How long were you first first vice president?
- Approximately about five years. 8 Α.
 - How long were you treasurer before that? Q.
- 10 About 15 years. Α.
- 11 What are your duties currently as president of the
- Correction Officers Benevolent Association? 12
- 13 A. As a president of the union, it is my duty basically --
- 14 basically the president of the union is like the CEO of a
- 15 company, responsible for the day-to-day operation and ensuring
- that the Correction Officers Benevolent Association's rights, 16
- 17 the rights of -- protect the rights of the union, collective
- 18 bargaining and things we represent our members on.
- 19 What duties did you have as vice president for before that?
- 20 As the vice president of the union, my duties were those
- 21 that were assigned to me by the president.
- 22 What did those include in your case?
- 23 It included being responsible for dealing with the office
- 24 of the commissioner of the agency, dealing with the chief of
- 25 the department, working with the other board members to ensure

- that the rights of correction officers were upheld and protected and whatever else was assigned.
 - Q. How about as treasurer before that, sir, what were your duties and responsibilities as treasurer?
 - A. As a treasurer, my duties and responsibilities pretty spelled out in our Constitution and bylaws, but responsible for ensuring, overseeing the funds, checks, writing checks, making sure the bills are paid, making sure that our books were balanced and basically the duties of chief financial officer.
 - Q. I think you touched on this a little bit, but what is the purpose of the union, of COBA?
 - A. The purpose of the union is to represent the men and women who are members of the union. Part of our job is to negotiate collective bargaining agreements. Part of our job is to ensure and get legislation that benefits correction officers, to represent correction officers through everything, and every aspect as far as their benefits are concerned. We're responsible for optical and dental and prescription and negotiating with the city and negotiating with the Department of Corrections.
 - Q. How many members does COBA have?
- A. Currently COBA has 10,600 active members and about the same amount of retired members.
 - Q. Where does COBA rank among the largest unions of its type?
 - A. We're considered the second largest law enforcement union

- 1 | in the city.
- 2 | Q. What qualifies someone to be a member of the union?
- 3 A. You have to take the test to become a New York City
- 4 correction officer. If you pass the test, you meet all the
- 5 requirements, you enter the academy and you become a member of
- 6 the correction officers union, COBA.
- 7 Q. Are all of New York City's or substantially all of New York
- 8 | City's correction officers members of the union?
- 9 A. They're all members.
- 10 \parallel Q. Who was your predecessor as president of the union?
- 11 A. My predecessor was Norman Seabrook.
- 12 | Q. How long was Norman Seabrook president of COBA?
- 13 A. Approximately 20 years.
- 14 | Q. About how long ago did you meet Mr. Seabrook?
- 15 A. I met Mr. Seabrook I believe in 1991-'92.
- 16 | THE COURT: Let me check with you with the jurors.
- 17 Are you able to hear the witness okay? I remind the witness to
- 18 keep your voice up because the acoustics aren't great.
- 19 BY MR. BELL:
- 20 Q. How was it you first came to meet Mr. Seabrook?
- 21 A. I met Mr. Seabrook when he was a candidate running for
- 22 | office, running to be the president of the union.
- 23 Q. How was it that Candidate Seabrook came to get to know you?
- 24 A. At the time that he was candidate for office, I was working
- 25 | in one of the largest jails on the island, and I was writing

- and producing a newsletter, and he found out that it was me, 1 2 that I was writing this newsletter, and he came to my jail and
- 3 asked me to come to a meeting and subsequently asked me to join
- 4 his group that was running for office.
- 5 Did you do that? Ο.
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 Was that electoral group or slate successful come election time? 8
- 9 Α. Yes, we were.
- 10 Have you been a member of the executive board ever since?
- 11 Yes, I have been. I have been a member of the executive
- 12 board since 1995.
- 13 Q. What gains, if any, was the union able to make once that
- 14 slate came into power?
- 15 A. Well, once we were elected to office, we made substantial
- We were able to get legislation for correction officers 16
- 17 such as things such as three quarter disability bill, a heart
- bill. We were able to get at least 30, 40 different pieces of 18
- 19 legislation passed for correction officers.
- 20 We were successful in negotiating at least more than
- 21 7, 8 contracts, getting corrections officers raises and a host
- 22 of other things that we were successful in doing.
- 23 Q. How did that compare to the progress made under previous
- 24 boards or slates?
- 25 I am sorry? Say that again. Can you ask that.

5

6

7

11

12

23

24

- Q. Sure thing. I asked you about what gains, if any, the union was able to make once your slate, Mr. Seabrook's slate, came into power?
 - How did those gains compare with the progress that previous boards were able to make?
 - A. There was no comparison.
 - Q. What do you mean, there was no comparison, sir?
- A. Where we were successful in taking corrections officers was far, far beyond where the previous administration or the people that we took over from was able to do.
 - Q. What accounted for the difference with this administration?

 Why was it more successful?
- 13 | A. Drive.
- 14 | Q. What do you mean by, "drive"?
- We wanted to do what we did for correction officers. 15 Α. 16 wanted to promote correction officers. We ran to get elected 17 to do exactly what it was that we did, and that was to promote 18 correction officers, that was to put correction officers on the 19 map, that was to make sure that everybody in the City of New 20 York, the state or country or the world, knew that we were 21 correction officers and we were to be respected as every other 22 law enforcement agency was.
 - Q. In what ways did Mr. Seabrook as president contribute to that period and those gains?
 - A. He was, Mr. Seabrook was the face and the voice of the

1 union.

- Q. How visible was he as the face or the voice of the union during that period of time?
- A. He was probably more visible than most union leaders in the city. Anything that had anything to do with corrections, we
- 6 definitely were there. Anything that had anything to do that
- 7 | affected our members, we were there, he was there. It didn't
- 8 matter whether it was dealing with Albany, dealing with City
- 9 Hall, City Council, whoever it was that we had to deal with he
- 10 was definitely visible.
- 11 Q. Serving as the public face of the union and dealing with
- 12 | those various entities outside of the union, how would you
- 13 characterize his style or behavior as the public face of the
- 14 | union?
- 15 A. I would characterize it as effective.
- 16 \parallel Q. In what ways?
- 17 A. Usually whatever we set out to accomplish is what we did,
- 18 | it is what we accomplished.
- 19 | Q. How would you characterize the way or ways in which Mr.
- 20 | Seabrook dealt with forces within the union?
- 21 A. Pretty much in your face, I mean up close and personal.
- 22 | Q. What do you mean by in your face or up close and personal?
- 23 A. Usually meaning that when you were dealing with Norman,
- 24 | basically one thing that he always said was he said bring your
- 25 A game, so basically that was his personality.

- 1 Q. What did you understand bring your A game to mean?
- 2 A. Be able to back up, defend or protect whatever it is,
- 3 | whatever the issue is that you're bringing to the table or that
- 4 you're promoting.
- Q. Are you familiar with something within COBA called the
- 6 executive board?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. What is COBA's executive board?
- 9 A. The C O B A, COBA's executive board consists of at this
- 10 | time of 15 members who are part of being responsible for the
- 11 | running of the union and the day-to-day operation of the union.
- 12 | Q. Did that group meet periodically under Mr. Seabrook?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. How would you describe Mr. Seabrook, how Mr. Seabrook
- 15 | interacted with members of the executive board below him?
- 16 A. I don't understand. What do you mean?
- 17 Q. Well, for example, how did Mr. Seabrook go about
- 18 presiding -- how would you describe how Mr. Seabrook presided
- 19 over meetings of the executive board?
- 20 A. Well, he definitely presided over it. He definitely
- 21 | conducted them. He definitely ran the meeting as the president
- 22 of the union is supposed to or should.
- 23 | Q. What do you mean by that?
- 24 A. Well, if you're basically in charge of the meeting, you
- 25 | call the meeting. If there is an agenda, you address the

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

- agenda. If there are issues, you basically go around the table. He would usually say what do you have? What do you have? What do you have? And basically that interaction between him and whichever particular board member is what it would be.
 - Q. Were there instances in which Mr. Seabrook and the other members of the executive board below him disagreed in those settings?
 - A. Yeah, like every other board, yes, we definitely had disagreements.
- Q. How or in what ways did Mr. Seabrook handle those disagreements?
 - A. I mean there were times where there might have been yelling and screaming. There were times when maybe it wasn't, but it pretty much depended on the situation or the issue at hand.
 - Q. When you say there might have been yelling and screaming, specifically do you mean on Mr. Seabrook's part?
 - A. Yes, on his part and at times on part of other board members, depending on who they were.
- Q. What sorts of powers did Mr. Seabrook have over fellow members of the executive board?
 - A. Well, basically as the president of the union, all of the executive board members performed duties that are prescribed to them or assigned to them by the president of the union, and in addition to whatever other duties is defined in our

1 | Constitution and bylaws.

THE COURT: Let's do this. We are going to take our 30-minute break now. Don't discuss the case amongst ourselves or with anyone else. Don't do independent research regarding issues or parties in this case. See you at 12:30.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: You can sit down.

So, counsel, let's do this. First things first.

Let's talk about how to handle the situation with Juror No. 1.

Let me tell you what I plan to do and then let me hear what counsel's thoughts are.

It seems to me what makes sense is to after the break, bring Juror No. 1 out here, let Juror No. 1 know we have been informed that there was an issue in which his mother's home health care aid was hit by a car, and he needed to make some arrangements, and I will ask him whether or not he was able to make those arrangements.

If he says he was not able to make those arrangements, my plan would be to make my robing room available to him and he can use the phone in there, and he can use the internet service in there in case he needs to look up anything. That would be my recommendation. Do counsel have any other thoughts or anything else you want me to do in this regard?

MR. BELL: That sounds fine, your Honor.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: My only question is if we do it after

Is

the break and he is using the internet in there, we can take a
half hour, 45 minutes, and I wonder whether it makes sense to
do it at 2:30?
THE COURT: We can do that, too. At 2:30 he is done.
He can use his cell phone or whatever the case may be. We can
do that, too. I was trying to see if there is a way to
expedite it. I understand.
I want to make sure. I am not sure what arrangements
he needs to make, and if it is something where it is simply the
home health care aid worked for some sort of agency, if it is a
matter of contacting the agency and getting someone to sub as
his home health care aid, it shouldn't take that much time. If
we get too long and it may be too late in the day to get a
substitute. Let me hear from counsel.
MR. MAZUREK: Judge, I am happy to give the gentleman
whatever he needs in order to accomplish that at 12:30 that
makes sense.
MR. BELL: We are, too. I acknowledge the possibility
that Juror No. 1 is attending to that now. Whatever he needs
by the time we get to the other side of the break, we will be
reasonable.
MR. MAZUREK: I think it may be on his mind and
distracting him while he is listening to the testimony.
MR. SCHECHTMAN: I withdraw my suggestion.

THE COURT: Then let's deal with the other matter.

25

morning.

Ms. Hendon here and her client? 1 2 MR. CAPONE: She must be in the -- perhaps we can come 3 back five minutes early and deal with it then. 4 THE COURT: Yes, we can do that. I don't know if it 5 will take five minutes. You believe Ms. Hendon is here in the 6 building and her client is in the building? 7 MR. CAPONE: Yes. THE COURT: I don't want to keep the jury waiting. 8 9 Why don't we try to deal with this at 12:20 and counsel can get 10 a 15-minute break. Does that sound good to everyone? See you at 12:20. 11 12 (Recess) THE COURT: Hold on. Is Ms. Hendon here? Okay. 13 Ιs 14 your client here? 15 MS. HENDON: He is. THE COURT: Let's bring him up here to the witness 16 17 stand. 18 MS. HENDON: Judge, could I approach with the other counsel before my client takes the stand briefly? You may know 19 20 what I am going to ask and you may already have a ruling. I 21 want to make sure you do. 22 THE COURT: I believe I understand what your request will be. That request was relayed to me by the government this 23

putative witness take the stand. Stand. Raise your right

That request is denied. Let's have the witness,

hand.

2 GILAD KALTER,

called as a witness by the Government,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURT: You may have a seat.

Before we get into this, let me get a sense from counsel for Mr. Kalter as to whether or not you have advised your client to assert the Fifth Amendment and give me a sense as to why?

MR. CAPONE: Mr. Seabrook is not here.

MR. SCHECHTMAN: I am happy to proceed on this issue. I waive his appearance.

MS. HENDON: I have so advised my client, your Honor.

My advice is based on the existence of another matter, not the matter that your Honor's jury is hearing, of the matter of United States versus Huberfeld, et al. My understanding is my client is a witness in that matter, but there is another related matter as to which there may be subject matter overlap.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me get a sense from the government as to the subject areas that you would like to go into in terms of your direct examination of this witness.

MR. CAPONE: The subject matters, your Honor, include this witness' history of Platinum Partners, Murray Huberfeld's history of Platinum, work with Murray Huberfeld for quite some time and Platinum Partners and the predecessor firm, the

HAOJSEA3 Kalter - direct

solicitation of the Correction Officers Benevolent Association
as to which this witness played a role, some information
regarding redemptions at Platinum Partners and other general

THE COURT: Okay. So let's do this. Let's have Ms.

Hendon, if you can stand next to your client, and let's have

the government ask one general question regarding those subject

areas. Lets see what the answers are.

- 9 | GILAD KALTER,
- 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

background information.

- 11 BY MR. CAPONE:
- 12 | Q. Mr. Kalter, have you been subpoenaed to testify today?
- 13 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

- 14 | Q. I would like to ask you questions today about your time at
- 15 | Platinum Partners as well as Mr. Huberfeld and soliciting
- 16 clients as well as the benevolent association. Are you willing
- 17 | to answer those questions?
- 18 | A. No.
- 19 \parallel Q. Why is that?
- 20 | A. I decline to answers based on my constitutional rights.
- 21 THE COURT: Which one in particular?
- 22 | THE WITNESS: The Fifth Amendment.
- 23 | THE COURT: Okay.
- 24 MR. CAPONE: I think that is suffices to invoke the
- 25 order, your Honor, that we ask you to sign.

HAOJSEA3 Kalter - direct

1 THE COURT: All right. Since this witness has refused on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination to 2 3 testify or provide other information in a proceeding before a 4 Court of the United States, I, as the person presiding over the 5 proceeding, communicate to this witness an order issued under 6 18 U.S. Code 6002, and the witness may not refuse to comply 7 with this order on the basis of your privilege against self-incrimination. Do you understand? 8 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Have you, in fact, seen a copy of that 11 order? 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Is there anything further, counsel for the 14 government? 15 MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Anything further, Ms. Hendon? 17 MS. HENDON: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Anything from counsel for Mr. Seabrook or Huberfeld? 19 20 MR. MAZUREK: No, your Honor. 21 MS. LYNAUGH: No, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. We are finished then. 23 (Witness excused) 24 MR. BELL: Should we get the witness, Mr. Husamudeen? 25 THE COURT: Not yet. We need to deal with the issue

HAOJSEA3 Kalter - direct

with the juror before we bring the witness back in.

I thought about something else that may make sense to ask this juror. Again I will ask this juror whether or not he has had an opportunity to make the phone calls or make contact in terms of getting another home health care aid for his mother, and if he has, then that is fine. If he hasn't, as I mentioned, I will let him use the robing room and the phone in there and the internet there.

If he has or when he has, I am wondering, and I want counsels' input on this, if it makes sense to get a sense of, without getting too much in his mother's health care situation, what time the home health care aid normally arrives or something just to make sure this juror can get here at 9:00 o'clock.

If the juror can't get here at 9:00, or if it would be better for the juror to get here at 9:30, I am willing to adjust the schedule for tomorrow and have the jurors get here at 9:30. My only concern is if there is a brand new home health care aid, I don't know what his mother's medical situation is, it might be frightening to her to see some brand new person there if he is not sort of there to make the introduction. Those are just thoughts that come into my mind. I will give counsel a chance to think about that and let me know if you think we should go into that a little bit.

(Continued on next page)

1	MR. SHECHTMAN: I think, from the defense's point of
2	view, they're good thoughts and you should go into it.
3	MR. CAPONE: We agree, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else? I'll
5	come back out in two minutes at 12:30.
6	MR. BELL: No, your Honor.
7	(Recess)
8	(In open court; Juror No. 1 present)
9	THE COURT: Okay. Hi.
10	JUROR: Hi.
11	THE COURT: My deputy informed me that your mother's
12	home healthcare provider was hit by a car yesterday.
13	JUROR: Yes, sir.
14	THE COURT: And that you needed to make some
15	arrangements for a replacement. Were you able to make those
16	arrangements yet?
17	JUROR: No. I mean, I came straight over here today.
18	I couldn't do that.
19	THE COURT: Okay. So does the home healthcare aide
20	who usually works with your mother, do they work for an agency?
21	JUROR: Yes, worked for an agency.
22	THE COURT: So what we can do to help in this regard,
23	I can let you use my robing room. We have internet service in
24	there, in case you need to look up the name of the agency. You
25	can use the phone in there to make calls to try to set up the

1	replacement. Is that something that you'd be willing to do?
2	JUROR: I mean, I can wait until I get home because I
3	have to figure out what's going on with her, if she probably
4	already got somebody or they're already making arrangements. I
5	don't know, yet. So I just know what happened yesterday. I
6	know they kind of lack on sending people. Sometimes it can
7	take a week or it could be three days, depending if they find
8	somebody.
9	THE COURT: All right. So if you want to make the
10	calls now, you can do that. Would you want to do that now?
11	JUROR: No.
12	THE COURT: You want to wait until the end of the day?
13	JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Let me get a sense, when the home
15	healthcare aide normally comes to see your mother, is there
16	someone else usually there besides the home healthcare aide and
17	your mother when the home healthcare aide arrives?
18	JUROR: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay. But does your mother understand
20	what's happening? I just want to make sure there's not a
21	situation where your mother is alarmed by a new person coming
22	in. Does your mother understand what's happening?
23	JUROR: Yeah, yeah.
24	THE COURT: Okay. So you're fine with making these
25	calls later?

JUROR: Yes, definitely. 1 THE COURT: So I just want to also make sure that none 2 3 of this is weighing on your mind so heavily that it's difficult 4 for you to --5 JUROR: I appreciate that. 6 THE COURT: Are you still able to concentrate on 7 what's happening here? JUROR: Yes, definitely. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. Just hand the microphone to my 10 deputy for a second, step back to the jury room. Don't discuss 11 with the other jurors what we've discussed out here. Okay? 12 JUROR: All right. 13 (Juror not present) 14 THE COURT: Any further questions that counsel want? I think we may be good here. 15 MR. BELL: We are. 16 17 THE COURT: And defense counsel? MS. LYNAUGH: We're fine, also, your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Anything else anyone one wants me to do? 20 MR. BELL: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: So I guess what we should do -- well, what 22 my thinking now is trying to figure out whether or not it makes 23 sense to bring this juror out here just to say thank you for 24 telling us that, and then let him go in and then bring 25 everybody out, or if you think it makes sense, we can just

bring all the jurors out at this point. 1 2 He seems to be fine. I don't think there's any need 3 to have any further communication with him, but I just wanted to find out what counsel's view is. 4 MR. BELL: I think he's fine, your Honor. 5 6 MS. LYNAUGH: We agree, your Honor. 7 MR. MAZUREK: Bring in the full jury. THE COURT: Let's get the witness on the stand and 8 9 bring in the jury, and also, hold on. It seems, again, my 10 other concern is it doesn't seem that there's any need to start 11 late. It seems like we can start at 9:00. Does counsel agree 12 with that? 13 MR. CAPONE: Yes. 14 MS. LYNAUGH: Yes. 15 THE COURT: All right. Let's bring the jury in. 16 (Jury present) 17 THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. Welcome back. 18 Let's continue with the case on trial. Let's do another quick 19 audibility check on the mic. 20 MR. BELL: Check one, two; check one, two. 21 THE COURT: Can you give us a testing one, two, three? 22 THE WITNESS: Testing one, two, three. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Again, any members of the jury, if 24 you have difficulty hearing at any point, just raise your hand,

let me know, and we'll make the necessary adjustments.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Another thing you should know. This is a beautiful building, it's an old building; so occasionally when it's very windy outside, these windows are going to shake a little bit and they're going to rattle a little bit, but they are secure and you are safe. Okay?

Go ahead, counsel.

MR. BELL: Thank you, your Honor.

BY MR. BELL:

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Husamudeen.
- 10 A. Good afternoon.
- Q. When we broke, you were discussing the way in which the president can give members of the executive board some
- 13 | assignments?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. What are examples of some of those assignments?
- 16 A. Some of those assignments can be, you can be assigned to
- 17 | work with the -- let's just say chief of security. You can be
- 18 assigned to work -- be responsible for a particular facility.
- 19 | You can be responsible for dealing with the delegates, handling
- 20 whatever it is that the president assigns to you besides
- 21 | whatever your duties are.
- 22 | Q. Are some of those assignments more demanding than others?
- 23 A. I would say yes.
- Q. And in your experience, are some of those assignments more
- 25 | widely desired than others?

- A. I would think that some are more desirable than others, yes.
- Q. Who controls which executive board members get which assignments?
- A. It's pretty much whatever is assigned to you, whatever your duties are in the constitution and bylaws, and whatever is assigned to you by the president. So it would be the president.
 - Q. Are you familiar with something called release time?
- 10 | A. Yes.

13

14

15

16

17

- 11 Q. And what, in the context of the executive board, does
 12 release time refer to?
 - A. Release time refers to executive board members who are fully released from their duties of a correction officer, and they're released to the union to perform whatever the duties are assigned to them by the president or the executive board or
- Q. Are you on release time as president of the Corrections

 Officers Benevolent Association?
- 20 | A. Yes, I am.

the constitution and bylaws.

- Q. Currently, are all of the members of the executive board on release time?
- 23 A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Was this also true with the executive board around the 25 2013, 2014 time frame?

- 1 | A. Yes, I -- yes.
- Q. Now, under release time, the executive board, how do the executive board members get paid?
- 4 A. The executive board members are paid a stipend by the
- 5 Correction Officer Union, and they're paid their regular salary
- 6 as a correction officer.
- Q. And who controls whether a given executive board member is on release time or not?
- 9 A. That comes from the office of the president.
- 10 Q. And prior to your ascent to the role of president, would
- 11 | that have been Mr. Seabrook who controlled that?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. Now, when a correction officer, a member of the executive
- 14 | board, is on release time, do they have to work at the jails
- 15 | themselves?
- 16 | A. No.
- 17 Q. Where do they work?
- 18 A. They work out of the correction officers -- out of the
- 19 union office, and they're assigned field duties working out in
- 20 | the field.
- 21 | Q. So I want to show you, and I think that we're just going to
- 22 | put this on your screen to save me a bit of a journey. What
- 23 | are Government Exhibits 652 and 656? Do you see those, sir?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. Are you familiar with what's depicted in those pictures?

- 1 | A. Yes, I am.
- 2 | Q. And what's depicted there?
- 3 A. One is a picture of the reception area in our main office
- 4 at 75 Broad, and the other is a picture of the conference room
- 5 | at 75 Broad.
- Q. You mentioned 75 Broad. Is that the location of COBA's
- 7 offices?
- 8 A. Yes, the main office is located at 75 Broad Street in
- 9 | Manhattan.
- 10 | O. Is there an additional office?
- 11 | A. We have a satellite office in Queens, near Rikers Island.
- 12 Q. Do Government Exhibits 652 and 656 fairly and accurately
- depict their respective parts of COBA's offices?
- 14 | A. I'm sorry?
- MR. SHECHTMAN: I have no problem admitting these and showing them to the jury.
- 17 THE COURT: Okay. They're in evidence.
- 18 (Government's Exhibits 652 and 656 received in
- 19 | evidence)
- 20 MR. BELL: Can we go ahead and publish 652 and 656.
- 21 || And --
- 22 | THE COURT: Hold on a second. For the jurors, do you
- 23 have that on your screens yet?
- 24 JURORS: No.
- MR. BELL: It may take a moment, your Honor.

- THE COURT: You have it now? Go ahead, counsel.
- 2 MR. BELL: Thank you, your Honor.
- 3 BY MR. BELL:
- 4 | Q. And so I think you mentioned that the one on the left was
- 5 | the reception area?
- 6 A. Yes.

- Q. And what's that on the right, 656?
- 8 A. On the right is the conference room.
- 9 Q. Can we also show just to Mr. Husamudeen for the moment 657 and 658.
- 11 MR. SHECHTMAN: Same thing, no problem showing these
 12 and admitting them to the jury and showing.
- THE COURT: Okay. Those are admitted. Are you moving to admit those in evidence?
- MR. BELL: We are, your Honor.
- 16 | THE COURT: Okay. They're admitted without objection.
- 17 (Government's Exhibits 657 and 658 received in
- 18 | evidence)
- MR. BELL: Can we publish 657 and 658 to the jury as
- 20 | well?
- 21 | Q. Mr. Husamudeen --
- 22 | THE COURT: Hold on. There's a little bit of a delay.
- 23 All right. Do the jurors have it now? Okay. Go ahead.
- 24 BY MR. BELL:
- 25 | Q. Mr. Husamudeen, are you familiar with what's depicted here?

- HAOPSEA4
- 1 Α. Yes, I am.
- And what do we see in 657 and 658? 2 Q.
- 3 It's the office of the president at 75 Broad Street.
- Thank you, Ms. Bustillo. We can take those down. Are you 4 Q.
- 5 familiar, within the language used by COBA and its executive
- board, with the term "being sent back"? 6
- 7 Α. Yes.
- And what does being sent back refer to? 8
- 9 Well, that's a term that's used -- being sent back means
- 10 that your release time will be taken away, and you'll be sent
- 11 back to whatever your facility is or wherever it was you worked
- 12 before you were on release time.
- 13 Q. And who has the power to send a member of the executive
- board back to the jails the way you've described? 14
- 15 A. The president.
- Q. Does the -- does being a member of the executive board come 16
- 17 with other perks or benefits that correction officers
- 18 ordinarily would not get?
- 19 A. Yes.
- What are some examples of these? 20
- 21 You're provided a vehicle, a car, E-ZPass, gas card, things
- 22 of that nature.
- 23 And who controls whether an executive board member gets
- 24 access to those things?
- 25 Well, ultimately, everything is controlled -- comes through

- the office of the president, but those are things that pretty
 much have come with the position.
- 3 | Q. Now, are you familiar with an individual named William
- 4 | Valentin?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And how are you familiar with Mr. Valentin?
- 7 A. He's a former board member.
- 8 | Q. Approximately when did he become a board member and when
- 9 | did he stop?
- 10 A. I believe he became a board member in 2010, 2010, 2012.
- 11 | Q. And when did he cease to be a board member?
- 12 A. I believe around, if my memory is serving me correct, 2013,
- 13 | 2014.
- 14 | Q. Generally speaking, Mr. Husamudeen, how did Mr. Valentin
- 15 come to not be a member of the board anymore?
- 16 A. He was -- he was brought up on charges, found guilty and
- 17 removed.
- 18 Q. Without going into the substance of those charges, who
- 19 | initiated charges against Mr. Valentin?
- 20 | A. If I recall, as a matter of fact, I believe it was the
- 21 president, but I'm not sure.
- 22 | Q. Was there a time when a vote was taken as to whether
- 23 Mr. Valentin should continue to receive his stipend?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. Who initiated that vote?

- 1 A. I believe it was the president, if my memory is serving me correct.
 - Q. Was that Mr. Seabrook at the time?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And are there rules that govern the activities of the executive board and the union as a whole?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. What are those rules?
 - A. We are bound by the constitution and by laws of the COBA, of the Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association.

MR. BELL: And so, your Honor, at this time, I'd like to read a stipulation. It's Government Exhibit 1501. It's stipulated between the parties that, and then it references several exhibits. I'll note some of these now, but move for the stipulation of the relevant exhibits to be admitted. We may refer back to the rest later.

It's agreed between the parties that Government
Exhibit 301 contains audited financial statements for the
Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association annuity fund,
fiscal year 2013, prepared by Buchbinder, Tunick and Company,
LLP.

Government Exhibits 303, 304 and 305 contain the audited financial statements for the Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association for fiscal years 2012 to 2013, 2013 to 2014, 2014 to 2015, respectively, prepared by the same entity.

23

24

25

Government Exhibits 309, 3312 are true and accurate 1 2 minutes of meetings of the Corrections Officers' Benevolent 3 Association annuity fund board of the trustees that occurred on the dates set forth in the minutes prepared by counsel. 4 5 Government Exhibit 313 is a true and accurate copy of 6 an agreement of declaration of trust between COBA and the 7 trustees of the Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association 8 dated April 16th, 1998. 9 Government 314 contains the constitution and bylaws of 10 the Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association as of 11 January 2013, which has been in effect during the years 2013 12 through the present. 13 Government 401 is a true and accurate copy of a 14 private offering memorandum for Platinum Partners Value 15 Arbitrage Fund International Limited dated November of 2012. Government 403 contains a true and accurate copy of a 16 17 subscription agreement signed side letter, form W9, which the 18 Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association annuity funds subscribed to the Platinum Partners Value Arbitrage Fund 19 20 International Limited. 21

Government Exhibits 405 and 406 contain true and accurate copies of a subscription agreement, signed side letter, form W9, which by the Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association, Inc. subscribe to the Platinum Partners Value Arbitrage Fund International Limited.

1	Finally, Government 408 contains a true and accurate
2	copy of a subscription for additional interests by which the
3	Corrections Officers' Benevolent Association annuity fund made
4	an additional subscription to the Platinum Partners Value
5	Arbitrage Fund International Limited.
6	Stipulated and agreed that this stipulation,
7	Government 1501, and Government Exhibits 301, 303 through 305,
8	309, 3312, 401, 403, 405, 406 and 408 may be received in
9	evidence as government exhibits at trial, and it's signed by
10	the parties and dated October 23rd.
11	Your Honor, the government offers 1501 and the
12	referenced Exhibits 301, 303, 304, 305, 309, 3312, 401, 403,
13	405, 406 and 408.
14	THE COURT: Okay. So admitted.
15	(Government's Exhibits 1501, 301, 303, 304, 305, 309,
16	3312, 401, 403, 405, 406 and 408 received in evidence)
17	MR. BELL: Thank you. I'd ask Ms. Bustillo to publish
18	Government Exhibit 314.
19	BY MR. BELL:
20	Q. And as we publish that, Mr. Husamudeen, I'm holding a hard
21	copy, just so you can get a sense of the thickness of the
22	document. Hold on.
23	MR. BELL: Do the jurors have it?
24	JUROR: Yes.
25	THE COURT: Go ahead.

- 1 MR. BELL: Thank you, your Honor.
- 2 Q. Are you familiar with Government Exhibit 314?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And how are you familiar with 314?
- 5 A. This is the constitution and bylaws of the Corrections
- 6 Officers' Benevolent Association.
- Q. So, Ms. Bustillo, I'd ask if you could to take us to Page 3 of that document.
- Which states: Executive Board. I'm going to ask you about a number of the folks referenced here. First of all, do

you recognize Mr. Seabrook at the top of the list?

12 A. Yes.

- 13 Q. And immediately below that, is that you, sir?
- 14 A. Yes, it is.
- 15 Q. I direct your attention to five persons down, there's an
- 16 | individual listed next to Michael Maiello; do you see that?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And who is Mr. Maiello?
- 19 A. He's the treasurer for the union.
- 20 | Q. And was he the treasure around the 2013, 2014 time frame?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Immediately below Mr. Maiello there is another individual,
- 23 Amelia Warner. Do you recognize Ms. Warner?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Who is Ms. Warner?

- A. She's the financial secretary for the correction officer's union.
- 3 Q. I'd also like to direct your attention to the third from
- 4 | the bottom, where it says William Valentin; do you see
- 5 Mr. Valentin?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Are you familiar with him?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Who is Mr. Valentin?
- 10 A. He was -- he's a former board member, former corresponding
- 11 secretary for the union.
- 12 | Q. We will come back here in just a moment, but while we're
- 13 here, I'd ask that we publish first to Mr. Husamudeen,
- 14 Government Exhibits -- maybe we could do a four-way here,
- 15 Ms. Bustillo -- 711, 706, 707, and 703.
- 16 Are you familiar with the folks depicted here,
- 17 Mr. Husamudeen?
- 18 MR. SHECHTMAN: No reason for those not to be
- 19 submitted to the record.
- 20 MR. BELL: We offer them all.
- 21 | THE COURT: Okay. They're admitted and for the
- 22 record.
- 23 | (Government's Exhibits 711, 706, 707, and 703 received
- 24 | in evidence)
- MR. BELL: Can you publish them?

- 1 \parallel Q. And who is that?
- THE COURT: Just hold on a second. Okay. Go ahead,
- 3 | counsel.
- 4 MR. BELL: Thank you, your Honor.
- 5 Q. Mr. Husamudeen, who is that in the upper left, in 711?
- 6 A. That's Norman Seabrook.
- 7 \parallel Q. In the upper right?
- 8 A. Michael Maiello.
- 9 Q. And the lower left?
- 10 A. Amelia Warner.
- 11 | Q. And who is that in the lower right?
- 12 A. Elias Husamudeen.
- 13 | Q. And that's you?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Can we go back to 314, Ms. Bustillo, and back to that
- 16 executive board page.
- Now, Mr. Husamudeen, was this always the composition
- 18 of the executive board?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 | Q. Was there a time when it changed?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. How did the board's composition change?
- 23 A. We went from ten board members to 15 board members.
- 24 | Q. And what were the circumstances under which that expansion
- 25 | took place?

- A. We -- it was put out to a vote of the members of the union to expand the executive board. It was voted and approved, and the executive board went from ten board members to 15 board members.
- 5 | Q. And did that come with any costs to the union?
- 6 A. Yes, it did.
- 7 | Q. What was the nature of the costs?
- A. Well, when it happened, at that time, we didn't have what's called release time for the five additional members; so there was a cost involved that we had to pay the city for that
- 11 release time.
- Q. And were the new board members all on release time once their positions came into existence?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. I want to direct your attention now --
- MR. SHECHTMAN: Judge, could we just get a date on when that happened?
- 18 THE COURT: Sure.
- Q. When did that change take place, Mr. Husamudeen, approximately?
- 21 A. I believe it was -- actually, I don't even -- I believe it 22 was 2013 -- When the five additional people came on?
- 23 | Q. Yes, sir.
- 24 A. I believe it was around about 2010, I believe 2010.
- 25 | Q. When that --

- A. I could be wrong.
- Q. When that happened, was there a change to the union's constitution?
- 4 A. Yes.

Q. All right. We may come back to that in a moment. For the moment, let me direct your attention to Page 6 of this document, Ms. Bustillo, and let's focus in on the article two.

I'm going to read portions of this to you,

Mr. Husamudeen. It says: The objectives and purposes of the

association shall be to organization and represent all persons

performing the duties of correction officer under the

jurisdiction of New York City Department of Correction; to

assist its members in obtaining due recognition and appropriate

compensation for their professional work as correction officers

and in improving the conditions under which they work; to

promote the social welfare of its members; and to foster the

advancement of the professional skills of its members as

correction officers.

Let's pause there. What sorts of things did the union do to advance the professional skills of its members,

Mr. Husamudeen?

A. To foster the advancement of professional skills of its members. Well, one of the things that we do and did is involve ourselves with training and recommending the different types of training that we feel that our members would have benefited

would have changed.

1	from, such as example, additional mental health training in
2	dealing with mentally ill inmates, and just training in
3	whatever we felt would actually enhance or help us in our
4	perform our duties as corrections officers.
5	Q. I want to now direct your attention to Page 13 of the same
6	document. Ms. Bustillo, Article VI. That's the I if I
7	remember right from school. It concerns the executive board.
8	We're going to do the same thing here.
9	Section 1, labeled Powers reads: The executive board
10	of the association shall be composed of the elected officers of
11	the association. It shall be the governing body of the
12	association, except when meetings of the association are in
13	session. All matters affecting the policies, aims and means of
14	accomplishing the purposes of the association shall be decided
15	by the executive board unless this constitution provides
16	otherwise.
17	Section II concerns meetings. The executive board
18	shall meet on the third Wednesday of each month, except that
19	the president may change the date of any meeting on sufficient
20	notice.
21	Was there a time, Mr. Husamudeen, at around that 2013,
22	2014 window, where the frequency of meetings changed?
23	A. We had weekly meetings. We had monthly meetings. We met
24	Mondays, Fridays. I mean, we had meetings; so the frequency

members.

- Q. And who generally called meetings, Mr. Husamudeen?
 - A. The president.
 - Q. It goes on. The president may call other meetings of the executive board whenever, in his or her judgment, the interests of the association demanded it, upon notice which states the purpose of the meeting. A quorum shall consist of nine

I want to skip down to section 4. The executive board shall receive from the president, in advance of each fiscal year, a proposed budget for the coming year. Such proposed budget shall be subject to revision and approval by two-thirds vote of the executive board at a regular or special meeting thereof is modified from time to time.

During the time that Mr. Seabrook was president, who would introduce the budget?

- A. The president.
- Q. Let's switch out from the executive board section,
- 18 Ms. Bustillo, and move back to Page 10.

Article V says: Duties of executive officers, and reads: Section one, the president. The president shall be the chief executive and administrative officer of the association and shall conduct the affairs of the association in accordance with this constitution and with the decisions of the membership and the executive board. He shall preside at all meetings of the association and the executive board.

He or she shall, with the approval of the executive board, maintain suitable offices for the transaction of association business. He or she shall, under policies adopted by the executive board, employ, terminate, fix the compensation and expenses and direct the activities of such office and field staff as are required to effectively carry out the functions of his or her office.

And Section D says: He shall sign or countersign, as

And Section D says: He shall sign or countersign, as the case may be, all checks, authorization for expenditures, contracts and other official documents of the association.

Under Mr. Seabrook, Mr. Husamudeen, how did you understand the countersigning process of checks to work?

A. Well, our system out, we have a two-signature check. It requires the signature of the president, and it requires the signature of the treasurer; so the countersign is that signature.

- O. And would that have been Mr. Maiello?
- 18 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Now, I want to direct your attention to Page 11 of the same document. This concerns the treasurer. If we could look at just the first. Thank you. It says: The treasurer shall keep regular books of the account of the association, which books shall be subject to inspection by any member of the executive board upon reasonable notice. His or her accounts shall, at all times, be subject to the examination and audit by the

5

6

7

9

president or his or her designee.

I want to skip now, Mr. Husamudeen, down to section c,

which says: He or she shall maintain the following separate

accounts.

Reference is made immediately underneath to the general fund. Are you familiar with the general fund,

- Mr. Husamudeen?
- 8 | A. Yes.
 - Q. And what was the general fund?
- 10 A. The general fund is the dues account.
- 11 | Q. And when you say the dues account, what do you mean?
- 12 A. The general fund, when we collect dues from our members,
- 13 the dues that are collected goes into what's called a general
- 14 fund.
- 15 Q. Is the general fund also known as the COBA, Inc. account?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. And did it -- where did those dues ultimately go? What was
- 18 the purpose of the dues?
- 19 A. The general fund, the dues account is for the operation of
- 20 the union. It's for the day-to-day operations, for paying the
- 21 | rent, it's for paying the telephone bill, it's for paying for
- 22 | the cars, it's for paying for legal services. It pays for the
- 23 day-to-day operation of the union.
- 24 | Q. Are you familiar, in the context of that operating account,
- 25 | with something called the reserve?

- 1
- A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. What was the reserve?
- 3 A. Well, in each one of the accounts -- well, in the general
- 4 | fund, in particular, what we have is a reserve fund, and that's
- 5 | actually any monies that are not used. It ends up -- we call
- 6 | it a reserve. It's in the account, but it ends up in the
- 7 reserve fund.
- 8 | Q. What's --
- 9 A. Meaning it's there for whatever else we have to do, as far as the union is concerned.
- 11 Q. What are some circumstances under which the union might
- 12 have to draw upon the reserve?
- 13 A. Well, if the -- if the amount of money or dues that we take
- 14 | in for the month isn't enough to cover the amount of the
- 15 | expenditures, then we would reach into the reserves to cover
- 16 | that.
- 17 | Q. Who made decisions with respect to the money in the
- 18 operating account or general fund account?
- 19 A. Ultimately, the president does.
- 20 | Q. Did the operating account have trustees?
- 21 | A. The members of the executive board, in this particular
- 22 case, are the trustees of the general fund.
- 23 Q. And the president, you mentioned, of course, submitted a
- 24 | budget. Did that budget pertain to the operating account?
- 25 A. Yes, it does.

- 1
- 2 operating account money that was invested for growth purposes?

Now, in the years prior to 2014, was the money in that

- 2 perating account money that was invested for growth purposes?
- 3 A. In the years prior to that, no. Well, they were invested,
- 4 but they were only invested in things such as a money market
- 5 account or certificate of deposit, that type of stuff, but not
- 6 invested. It's not a fund for investment. It's a fund for the
- 7 operation of the union.
- 8 | Q. And the things that the fund was invested in that you
- 9 mentioned, money marketing accounts, things of that sort, were
- 10 | those generally conservative investments --
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. -- or aggressive investments?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. What was the purpose of those modest investments?
- 15 | A. The purpose of having the money market or a CD or
- 16 certificate of deposit was just not to have that amount of
- 17 | money sitting in a checking account, such as a
- 18 non-interest-bearing checking account, things of that nature.
- 19 | Q. Prior to 2014, was that money, to your knowledge, ever put
- 20 | in a hedge fund?
- 21 | A. No.
- 22 | Q. Prior to 2014, was that money ever put in any sort of
- 23 | aggressive investment vehicle or instrument?
- 24 | A. No.
- 25 | Q. Was there a reason why not?

- A. It's for the operation of the union. It's not for -- the dues account, the general fund is not for investment. It's for the operation of the day-to-day, the business of the union.
 - Q. I want to direct your attention back to the screen and two slots under general fund reference is made to the annuity fund; do you see that, sir?
- 7 | A. Yes, I do.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

- Q. What is the annuity fund?
 - A. The annuity fund is a benefit that was negotiated by the union on behalf of correction officers, and the city makes contributions to the union on behalf of each member and the annuity fund. The trustees of the annuity fund is responsible for investing this money, and correction officers, when they retire or get promoted or leave the job, they get this money.
- 15 It's sort of like a pension supplement.
- Q. So what would happen with respect to the annuity fund when an individual correction officer retired?
 - A. When an individual correction officer retired, he or she would receive whatever their share of the annuity fund is and a check.
 - Q. And what was the purpose of that payout?
- A. That was a benefit that was negotiated for our members. It acts as a pension supplement.
- 24 | Q. Where did the money in the annuity fund come from?
- 25 A. It came from the contributions from the City of New York.

5

9

10

- Q. Now, I think you mentioned the board of trustees a moment ago. Who made decisions with respect to the annuity fund?
- 3 A. Decisions were made by the annuity fund board of trustees.
 - Q. And who were the members of the annuity fund board of trustees, position-wise?
- A. The member -- the board of trustees on the annuity fund was
 the president of the union, the first vice president, the
 secretary and the treasurer.
 - Q. And so I want to direct your attention now to that same window, 2013, 2014. Do you recall who the members of the annuity fund board of trustees were at that time?
- 12 A. The same four people. Norman Seabrook, Elias Husamudeen,
 13 Michael Maiello and Amelia Warner.
- Q. Now, did the board of trustees for the annuity fund have assistance in making its decisions as to what to do with the money?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. From whom?
- 19 A. I don't understand.
- Q. Sure thing. You mentioned a moment ago that the members of the board of trustees for the annuity fund had assistance in making decisions. Who provided that assistance? Who helps the members of the annuity fund board of trustees make their decision?
- 25 A. Oh, we, the annuity fund, hired, you know, professionals to

- 1 assist us in doing that. We had a fund attorney that assists
- 2 | us. In addition to that, we have a consultant, an investment
- 3 consultant that assisted us in making decisions about
- 4 | investments.
- 5 Q. And so let me ask about each of those. You mentioned that
- 6 there was an attorney for the fund. Who was the --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. -- attorney for the fund?
- 9 A. The attorney for the fund was Koehler & Isaacs, Howard
- 10 Wien.
- 11 | Q. I'm sorry, you mentioned Howard Wien?
- 12 A. On behalf of Koehler & Isaacs, yes, Attorney Howard Wien,
- 13 and Richard Koehler.
- 14 | Q. And is Koehler & Isaacs a law firm?
- 15 | A. Yes, it is.
- 16 \ O. You also mentioned that there would be a consultant or
- 17 | advisor. Around 2013 and 2014, who was that?
- 18 A. That was Reynolds Consulting Company or Corporation, Thomas
- 19 Reynolds.
- 20 | Q. And who was Mr. Reynolds?
- 21 | A. He is, I believe, the owner of Reynolds Consulting.
- 22 | Q. And was he the point person at the Reynolds Company?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Now, how long had you been on the annuity fund board by the
- 25 | time 2014 came around?

- A. I've been a member of the board of trustee on the annuity fund since 1995.
- 3 Q. How had annuity fund money been invested prior to 2014?
- 4 A. We invest in stocks, bonds, convertibles, real estate,
- 5 things of that nature.
- 6 Q. In your experience from 1995 up until 2014, had the annuity
- 7 | fund board of trustees ever invested in a hedge fund?
- 8 A. No, we didn't.
- 9 Q. Now, you mentioned that it was invested in stocks and bonds
- 10 | and the like. Were there outside entities with whom -- who
- 11 | managed the annuity fund board's money?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. Who were those outside entities prior to 2014?
- 14 | A. Prior to 2013?
- 15 | Q. Prior to 2014. So up until 2014?
- 16 | A. We had --
- 17 | Q. I'll ask specifically about like in 2013 or so, what
- 18 | outside managers managed the annuity fund's money?
- 19 A. At that time, we had, I believe, three money managers. One
- 20 company was called Wright Investors, another company was Advent
- 21 | Capital, and the third company was real estate,
- 22 | Intercontinental Real Estate Investment Company.
- 23 | Q. Were there rules that governed the annuity fund's
- 24 | activities?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. I'm going to now direct your attention to Government
 Exhibit 313, which is in via the stipulation that I read
- 3 earlier. Are you familiar with Government's Exhibit 313, sir?
- 4 A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. How are you familiar with 313?
- A. This is the trust agreement between the City of New York and the correction officers union.
- Q. And what did this -- what was the importance of this document, as a trustee for the annuity fund?
 - A. Well, this document pretty much explained the roles of the trustees and the powers of the trustees and what the trustees are responsible for, not responsible for.
 - Q. So I'd like for you, Ms. Bustillo, if you could, to first direct us to Page 3 of that document.

How are we doing, jury, can you see?

JUROR: Yes.

MR. BELL: Thank you very much.

Q. I want to direct your attention to where it says section 1.

Ms. Bustillo, can we highlight the first two full sentences.

Section 1: In accordance with the collective bargaining agreements between the City of New York and COBA, as the representative of all correction officers employed by the City of New York, a trust fund is hereby established, which shall be known as the annuity fund of COBA of the City of New York, herein called the fund.

24

25

The purpose of the fund shall be to receive monies paid to it by the City of New York, as well as such other property as may be transferred to the fund as authorized herein, and to use the same to provide annuity fund benefits for eligible correction officers and their beneficiaries, all in accordance with the terms of this agreement, and of such agreements between the COBA and the City of New York as may from time to time govern the use of monies provided by the city for the fund.

I now want to direct your to the next page, section 2, Thank you, Ms. Bustillo. The first couple of sentences of this section read: The fund shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this agreement by four trustees, who shall be persons holding office as the president, first vice president, treasurer, and financial secretary of the COBA, for as long as they each shall hold office, provided that any trustee may refuse to serve or may resign at any time by mailing or delivering written notice of such refusal or resignation to the COBA. Any vacancy among the trustees resulting from a vacancy in the office of the president, first vice president, treasurer or financial secretary of COBA, or resulting from a refusal or resignation by any such officer of the COBA to serve as trustee, may be filled by designation of the president of the COBA or if the office of the president shall be vacant, then by designation of the first vice

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

1 president of the COBA.

During the time when Mr. Seabrook was president of the union, was he a member of the annuity fund board of trustees continuously?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Now, I want to direct your attention to Page 10 of that document. One moment. And just section, yes, Page 10 thank you, Ms. Bustillo, and can you highlight section 7(a). The trustees shall meet regularly at any semiannual or more frequent intervals as they may determine; or at the call of any two trustees, on at least two days' notice to all of the trustees, delivered personally or by certified or registered mail, or at any time, by the consent in writing of all of the trustees.

As a general matter, Mr. Husamudeen, who called the meetings of the annuity fund board of trustees?

- A. The chairman, which is the president of the union.
- Q. And was that Mr. Seabrook?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And, finally, here, with respect to meetings, as a general matter, who attended these meetings?
- A. The meetings were attended by the trustees, the fund
 attorneys and the investment consultant and, at times, we would
 bring in the managers, the money managers.
 - Q. Were there times when you would hear from prospective new

- 1 | money managers at these meetings?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And generally what would happen at those meetings?
- 4 A. Generally, at those meetings, they would come in with their
- 5 PowerPoint, make a presentation to the trustees, explaining to
- 6 us or detailing to us about their companies, about the assets
- 7 and how well they've done for other clients or how well their
- 8 | fund, or whatever it is they're investing, that they're
- 9 selling.
- 10 Q. What did you understand the purpose of those presentations
- 11 | to be?
- 12 | A. The purpose of those presentations is to get the trustees
- 13 | to invest monies and have them manage the monies.
- 14 | Q. Now I want to direct your attention to one more part of
- 15 | this document. On Page 19, section D, it says here: The
- 16 | trustees of the fund shall be responsible in a fiduciary
- 17 | capacity for all money, property, or other assets received,
- 18 managed or disbursed by them or under their authority on behalf
- 19 of such fund.
- 20 Mr. Husamudeen, what did you understand it to mean
- 21 | that you were serving as a fiduciary?
- 22 | A. Basically what it just said, that we are responsible for
- 23 | investing the money and ensuring that the money is safe, and
- 24 pretty much that's it.
- 25 | Q. Did you understand the other members of the board of

- 1 | trustees to also be fiduciaries?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Did that include Mr. Seabrook when he served on the board?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Now, let's take that down. Thank you, Ms. Bustillo.
- Did there come a time when you came to hear of a hedge
- 7 | fund called Platinum Partners?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. In what context, Mr. Husamudeen, did you first hear of
- 10 | Platinum Partners?
- 11 A. They came and made a presentation to the board of trustees.
- 12 | Q. Had you arranged that presentation?
- 13 | A. No.
- 14 Q. I want to focus your attention on that meeting.
- 15 | Approximately when did it take place?
- 16 | A. January 2014.
- 17 | Q. And had you -- and prior to that meeting, had you ever
- 18 heard of the Platinum Partners hedge fund?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 | Q. Prior to that meeting, were you aware of any plans that the
- 21 | annuity fund board had to invest in a hedge fund?
- 22 | A. No.
- 23 Q. Prior to that meeting, had you heard of a person named
- 24 | Murray Huberfeld?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. Mark Nordlicht?
- 2 | A. No.
- 3 | Q. Gilad Kalter?
- 4 | A. No.
- 5 Q. Andrew Kaplan?
- 6 A. No, sir.
- 7 | Q. Uri Landesman?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Who was present for the presentation?
- 10 A. Three -- three gentlemen from Platinum. I can't recall
- 11 | their names, but they came to make the presentation.
- 12 | Q. And about how long would you say the presentation was?
- 13 A. I don't know. Roughly no more than an hour.
- 14 | Q. What sorts of things did the people from Platinum say --
- 15 before we get there, where did this presentation take place?
- 16 A. At the COBA headquarters.
- Q. What kinds of things did the Platinum folks say during that
- 18 presentation?
- 19 A. Pretty much the same thing that everybody else says, this
- 20 | is our company, this is what we do, this is what we invest in,
- 21 | this is how we perform from this time to this time, or how
- 22 | we've performed over the years, and pretty much promising to do
- 23 | the exact same thing for us, if we agree to hire them.
- 24 | Q. Did anyone from the board of trustees itself, do you
- 25 recall, ask questions during that presentation?

- 1 A. I don't recall.
- 2 Q. Now, after the Platinum people were finished with their
- 3 presentations, where did they go?
- 4 A. They left.
- 5 Q. After they leave -- after they left, was there a discussion
- 6 about what you had just heard in the presentation?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Who was present for that discussion?
- 9 A. The fund attorney, the investment consultant and the
- 10 | trustees.
- 11 | Q. And what, if anything, did the board determine during that
- 12 | discussion?
- 13 A. If I recall, we made a determination that once they're
- 14 | vetted by the fund attorney and the investment consultant, if
- 15 | they check out, that we would invest money with them.
- 16 Q. Now, who among the board members had proposed that specific
- 17 course of action during that discussion?
- 18 A. The president.
- 19 Q. Mr. Seabrook?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Was there a discussion of how much they might invest?
- 22 | A. I believe we -- it was determined to be up to 10 million or
- 23 | \$10 million, a 10-million-dollar investment.
- 24 | Q. And do you recall who among the board members first
- 25 | broached that amount?

- A. The president.
- 2 | Q. Mr. Seabrook?
- 3 A. Yes.

- 4 | Q. Did anyone disagree with him?
- 5 | A. No.
- Q. And so at the conclusion of that conversation, what
- 7 | happened, what was decided?
- 8 A. At the conclusion, it became the responsibility of the fund
- 9 attorneys to vet the company to ensure that they actually
- 10 exist, along with the investment consultant, to ensure that
- 11 | they -- that they actually are within the rules, as far as the
- 12 | SEC and all the other things, and that was the duty of the fund
- 13 attorney and the consultant.
- 14 | Q. At the conclusion of that meeting, did you expect that once
- 15 | the lawyers and advisors checked out Platinum Partners, that
- 16 you would hear from them one way or the other?
- 17 A. That's usually how it was done.
- 18 | Q. Was it your expectation that that's how it would be done
- 19 | that time?
- 20 A. The way we -- the way it was normally done, they would vet
- 21 | the company, check the company out, and they would come back
- 22 | and we would have discussion, and then we would make a
- 23 determination as to whether we're going to invest or not.
- 24 | Q. Is that what happened this time, to your knowledge?
- 25 A. No.

2

3

4

5

7

- Q. Now, at the time of -- what did happen, sir? Did there come a time -- withdrawn.
- At the time of this meeting, did you have any reason to believe that Mr. Seabrook was profiting personally in any way from COBA's potential investments in Platinum Partners?
- 6 A. No, no.
 - Q. What knowledge, if any, did you have of any agreement between Seabrook and anyone affiliated with Platinum Partners?
- 9 A. None.
- 10 Q. Now, does the annuity fund board of trustees regularly keep 11 minutes?
- 12 A. Yes, we kept minutes.
- 13 Q. Who prepared those minutes?
- 14 A. Those minutes were prepared by the fund attorney.
- Q. And as a general matter, were you able to review those
- 16 | minutes?
- 17 | A. I'm sorry?
- 18 Q. Were you able to review those board meeting minutes?
- 19 A. Yes, those minutes are usually reviewed at the next
- 20 meeting.
- 21 | Q. So I want to direct your attention to Government
- 22 | Exhibit 310, which was admitted via stipulation. These are
- 23 | further stipulation minutes from the board meeting held on
- January 13th, 2014. Does that match with your understanding of
- 25 when that presentation took place?

Yes.

- 1
- Q. So I want to direct your attention first to where it says
- 3 at the top the trustees present, and which trustees were
- 4 present?

Α.

- 5 A. Norman Seabrook, the chair, myself, Elias Husamudeen,
- 6 Michael Maiello and Amelia Warner.
- 7 | Q. Thank you. Take that part down.

8 Now can we go to the next page and can we focus in on

- 9 | the section Roman VI, new business: I'll read a portion of it.
- 10 Uri Landesman Gilad Kalter and Andrew Kaplan made a proposal
- 11 | for Platinum Partners. Platinum offered hedge fund financial
- 12 | products, one of which the value arbitrage fund was being
- 13 offered to the annuity fund. Although Platinum was not a fund
- 14 of funds, nor did they have any labor union clients, the
- 15 | trustees felt the record of returns and reputation of the firm
- 16 warranted further investigation.
- So far, Mr. Husamudeen, does that comport with your
- 18 memory of what happened?
- 19 A. As far as I can recall, yes.
- 20 | O. I'll continue to read.
- 21 Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Wien were instructed to perform
- 22 | due diligence and to report back to the chair with their
- 23 results. Do you see that part, sir?
- 24 A. Yes, I do.
- 25 | Q. As a general matter, when due diligence was instructed,

- were the lawyers and investment advisers told to report back to the chair?
 - A. Like I said earlier, usually they would report back to the board. We would have a meeting to discuss their findings and then we would make a determination as to how we were going to
- 6 proceed.

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Do you recall Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Wien being instructed to report back to specifically to the chair as opposed to the board at that meeting?
 - A. No, honestly I don't recall. Usually, like I said, the process is they report back to us.
 - Q. It then continues. In the event the advisers find the investment be prudent, the chair was authorized to invest up to \$10 million, to be taken from assets held by Wright with Platinum.
 - Again does that comport with the chair being authorized to invest in accord with your recollection of what happened?
 - A. Again, the process was usually you report back to the Board of Trustees, we make a review, we look at it and we make a determination and we proceed from there.
- This particular, I don't really recall, to be honest with you, as far as this is concerned.
- MR. BELL: At this time I would like to read another stipulation. It is labeled Government Exhibit 1513. I will

read portions of it now and look to admit the relevant documents.

It is agreed between the parties that: On or about October the 30th, 2015, a search warrant was issued by United States Magistrate Judge for the email account Jona, J O N A, at JRS cap dot com hosted by Intermedia. Government exhibits — and there is a list of them — are true and correct copies of emails, attachments to those emails, contact entries and calendar entries from e-mail account Jona as JRS cap dot com, provided by Intermedia, in response to the third part.

There is another list of exhibits that says those are true and correct copies of emails and attachments to those emails sent to and/or from employees of Platinum Partners as indicated in the emails that were provided to the government pursuant to subpoenas served on Platinum Partners.

There is another smaller set of emails that says these government exhibits are true and correct copies of emails and attachments to those emails sent to and/or from employees of Platinum Partners as indicated in the emails that were obtained from servers at Platinum Partners.

Then there is another set of true and correct copies of emails and attachments to those emails sent to and/or from employees or officers of the Correction Officers Benevolent Association as indicated in the emails that were provided to the government pursuant to subpoena served on the Correction

Officers Benevolent Association.

Finally, Government Exhibit 1071 is a true and correct copy of an email sent to Thomas Reynolds that was provided to the government pursuant to a subpoena served on Mr. Reynolds.

It is further stipulated and agreed that this stipulation, which is Government Exhibit 1503, may be received into evidence as a government exhibit at trial. It is signed by the parties and dated October 23rd.

Your Honor, the government offers the stipulation itself which is 1503.

THE COURT: Okay. Before you go, counsel, let me give the jurors another instruction. We provided you with notepads and pens for you to take notes. Let me give you an instruction on note-taking.

Please keep your notes to yourself until you and your fellow jurors go into the jury room to decide the case and don't let your note-taking distract you such that you don't hear the answers by witnesses. When you leave at night, leave the notes in the jury room. No one is going to look into the notebooks. They're going to be left there.

My Deputy will gather the notebooks and they will be safeguarded. If you choose not to take notes, remember you should rely on your own memory of what has been said and do not be influenced by notes of other jurors. Some people remember better when they don't take notes and not everyone is a good

Α.

No.

note-taker. That doesn't mean those notes are a better 1 2 reflection of what happened in court than your memory is, and 3 again at the end of the case if there is any dispute about what 4 happened here in court, we have some very hard working and 5 talented Court Reporters who are taking everything down. 6 Go ahead, counsel. 7 MR. BELL: Would this also be a good time for your standard instruction of what stipulations are? 8 9 THE COURT: Sure. Let me just give you, a stipulation 10 is an agreement by the parties. So items that are stipulated 11 to means the lawyers have agreed that those items should come 12 into evidence and those stipulations count as evidence. 13 basically I will give you a more detailed definition of 14 stipulations later, but stipulations is basically just fancy 15 legal talk for an agreement between the parties. Okay? 16 Go ahead, counsel. 17 (Government Exhibit 1503 received in evidence) MR. BELL: Ms. Bustillo, I ask for you to put on 18 Mr. Husamudeen's screen Government Exhibit 1027. Government 19 20 1027 was one of the exhibits in the stipulation mentioned as 21 having been to or from employees of Platinum Partners that were 22 provided to the government via subpoena. BY MR. BELL: 23 24 Mr. Husamudeen, you're not a party to this email, are you?

1	Q. I want to direct your attention
2	THE COURT: Make sure you use the microphone.
3	THE WITNESS: Sorry.
4	MR. BELL: Thank your Honor.
5	MR. SCHECHTMAN: Judge, we are fine with the jury
6	seeing this to make it easier.
7	THE COURT: Thank you. Are you moving this into
8	evidence?
9	MR. BELL: The government offers 1027.
10	THE COURT: Any objection?
11	MR. MAZUREK: No objection.
12	THE COURT: It is in.
13	(Government Exhibit 1027 received in evidence)
14	BY MR. BELL:
15	Q. And so this is an email from individuals named David
16	Ottensoser to Gilad Kalter. Mr. Kalter was one of the folks
17	mentioned empty minute meeting?
18	THE COURT: Do the jurors have that?
19	MR. BELL: Sorry, your Honor.
20	BY MR. BELL:
21	Q. My update is a little better on the screen than the jury
22	does. My apologies. This is an email from David Ottensoser to
23	Gilad Kalter. Mr. Kalter was mentioned in the board meetings
24	and it is dated February 5, 2014. The subject is Platinum
25	Partners value arbitrage fund and Correction Officers

- Benevolent Association annuity fund.
- 2 I want to direct your attention to the bottom field
- 3 where it is from Howard Wien and Koehler & Issacs email
- Who is Mr. Wien? 4 address.
- 5 A. He is an attorney for Koehler & Issacs, a fund, one of our
- fund attorneys. 6
- 7 Q. It is copied to Norman Seabrook, Richard Koehler and Tommy
- 8 Reynolds. Do you see that?
- 9 Yes. Α.
- 10 Once again, who is Mr. Koehler?
- 11 Α. Richard Koehler is the partner in Koehler & Isaccs.
- 12 And Mr. Reynolds?
- 13 Reynolds is Tommy Reynolds from Reynolds Consulting. Α.
- 14 Are you a recipient on that email? Q.
- 15 Α. No.
- 16 Are any other of the trustees other than Mr. Seabrook? 0.
- 17 Α. No.
- 18 The field then reads: Attached are comments and requests
- 19 for individual information with respect to your proposal to the
- 20 COBA Annuity Fund. Renew and contact me at your earliest
- 21 convenience to discuss further. Thank you. At which point Mr.
- 22 Landesman forwards it further and says let's get this turned
- 23 around ASAP.
- 24 I want to direct your attention to the attachment.
- 25 to Page 2 of that document. This is a letter, dated February

- 5, 2014. Can we highlight the date, please. It is from

 Koehler & Isaccs law firm to Uri Landesman, Andrew Kaplan and

 Gilad Kalter at Platinum Partners Value Arbitrage Fund. Do you

 see that?
- 5 A. Yes.

Q. If we can very briefly take a look at the next page, and the next page. It is signed, as you can see, by Howard Wien with copies to Mr. Seabrook, Mr. Koehler and Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. Husamudeen, in or around February of 2014, do you recall receiving this letter?

- A. No.
- Q. Did you ever see this letter while in consideration of investing in Platinum Partners was being undertaken by the board?
- A. No.
 - Q. Let's go back two pages if we can. The letter says I am writing on behalf of my client, the Correction Officers

 Benevolent Association, in response to your recent presentation. The annuity fund is an employee fringe benefit fund.

Can we go down to the final paragraph on that page.

It continues the fiduciary obligations in these documents are similar to those existing for fringe benefit funds for regulated by the employment retirement income security act,

ERISA, although the annuity funds is not covered by ERISA. It

is for this reason the annuity fund carefully monitors proposed investments keeping in my the ERISA standard of a prudent man in acting in like capacity and the ERISA, a duty to minimize the risk of large losses.

To our knowledge -- highlight the first paragraph -- none of the prudent men in like capacity, that is, similar New York City supplemental retirement funds, have invested in the type of investment you propose. The annuity fund, however, is not adverse to being a trendsetter. If it is to be such, however, there needs to be enhanced protection for the participants.

At the time when the Platinum investment was discussed after that presentation, do you recall there being any conversation about whether any entities like COBA invested in this sort of fund?

- A. No, I don't recall.
- Q. So I want to direct your attention to the, there is a list of numbered items that begins thus, it is necessary to express the following concerns. Why don't we focus on the first two, Ms. Bustillo.

Under No. 1 it says the annuity fund has requested that its investment advisers and managers acknowledge they are fiduciaries, not only as a general matter, but as specifically described in ERISA Section 3 (21)(A), although the offering memorandum and subscription agreement take pains to shield the

23

24

25

1	fund, the investment manager, the partner and directors from
2	liability to the annuity fund, this is not acceptable to the
3	annuity fund, as each of these entities and individuals must
4	acknowledge their fiduciary obligations to the annuity fund.
5	Mr. Husamudeen, at the time that the investment was
6	being considered, do you recall having any conversations
7	regarding the concern expressed in Section 1 here?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Directing your attention to No. 2, the letter continues.
10	The OM is quite blunt about conflicts of interest.
11	The annuity fund, however, require fiduciaries to act with the
12	exclusive purpose of providing benefits. Permitting the
13	conflicts of interest present in the OM and SA would, offering
14	memorandum and subscription agreement, would sacrifice this
15	obligation.
16	Mr. Husamudeen, do you recall at the time of the
17	investment was being considered anyone discussing with you that
18	particular concern?
19	A. No.
20	Q. Let's direct your attention now to the remaining two
21	concerns, three and four.

No. 3. In light of the annuity fund's obligation to avoid large losses and to act with the exclusive purpose of providing benefits, the annuity fund cannot acknowledge, as required by the SA, that it has the financial ability to bear

the economic risk of losing its entire investment in the fund and has no need for liquidity.

Mr. Husamudeen, was that a concern that was discussed at all in your presence during the time of the investment being considered?

- A. No.
- Q. Do you recall any conversation whatsoever about whether the board had the financial ability to bear the risk of losing its entire investment?
- A. No, sir.
 - Q. Directing your attention to concern No. 4. It says as the annuity fund does not need liquidity to pay benefits, any amounts redeemed must be in cash. The annuity fund cannot accept the in kind payments required under the offering memorandum and subscription agreement.

Do you recall any conversations taking place while the investment was being considered involving that concern?

A. No.

Q. Can we zoom out and slightly more and go to the, "It is hoped" subparagraph.

It is hoped that the foregoing do not present insurmountable obstacles. Please direct me to a proposal as to how you believe these issues may be addressed. In addition, please provide the following information so as to further the annuity fund's due diligence.

Α.

Yes.

1 Now, were you ever made aware, Mr. Husamudeen, of a 2 proposal as to how those concerns might be addressed? 3 No. Α. 4 Why don't we take that exhibit down. Q. 5 I now want to direct your attention to what is marked as Government Exhibit 1072 for identification. We can put that 6 7 up on the screen for Mr. Husamudeen as well. MR. BELL: I can offer it if there are no objections? 8 9 MR. MAZUREK: No objection. 10 MR. SCHECHTMAN: No objection. 11 MR. BELL: Your Honor, I government offers 1072. 12 THE COURT: It is admitted without objection. 13 (Government Exhibit 1072 received in evidence) 14 BY MR. BELL: 15 Q. I want you to take a look at this email, Mr. Husamudeen. This is an he mail from Howard Wien to Norman Seabrook, dated 16 17 February 14, 2014. 18 THE COURT: Hold on. Do the jurors have it yet? Now 19 they do. 20 MR. BELL: Sorry about that, folks. 21 BY MR. BELL: 22 Q. Now that all of us can see an email, Government Exhibit 23 1072, from Mr. Wien to Mr. Seabrook, Mr. Koehler and 24 Mr. Reynolds on February 14th, 2014. Do you see that, sir?

Q. The subject line is Platinum Partners and it says please
see the attached per our discussion earlier today. Why don't
we go ahead and take a look at the attachment. Ms. Bustillo,
can we turn to the next page.
So this is a letter, dated February 14th, addressed to
Board of Trustees, Correction Officers Benevolent Association
Annuity Fund, 75 Broad Street, and so on.
You were a member of that Board of Trustees, weren't
you, Mr. Husamudeen?
A. Yes.
Q. During the time that the investment was being considered,
did you ever see this letter?
A. No.
Q. I want to direct your attention to the first couple lines.
It says dear trustees. We have been asked to review the
proposal to invest in the above referenced financial product.
It goes on, that product is a hedge fund.
Essentially, a hedge fund invests in investments that are of
higher risk than traditional equity investments.
Can we zoom out from there, Ms. Bustillo.
Let's go to to the last full paragraph on the page.
It says hedge funds are also an unusual investment for
retirement funds. To be sure, they are a valid asset class
when operated properly and for private investors, are a

reasonable part of an investment portfolio. Retirement funds,

however, are held to a particularly high standard of care as they invest for the benefit of others.

New York City's supplemental retirement funds, although managed by the various labor unions, are governed by the Comptroller's Office and by a supplemental agreement with the city. Both echo the standard of care required for retirement funds generally and require retirement fund trustees to operate with the prudence of like individuals. The annuity fund must also invest plan assets in a manner that minimizes the risk of large losses.

Mr. Husamudeen, in or around the time of the investment being considered, whether it is in this letter or anywhere else, do you recall being involved in conversations about the risks of this type of instrument for retirement funds?

- A. No.
- Q. Let's go to the next page. It then says you should be aware of the following before you decide on whether or not to invest in this product. One moment, please.

(Pause) Let's start with the next paragraph.

First, being that other benefit fund's investments are relevant to a discussion of any proposed investment, it is a concern that, to our knowledge, none of the other supplemental benefit funds are invested in this type of hedge fund.

Do you recall that coming up in any discussions of the

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Board of Trustees at the time the investment was being considered?
- 3 A. I don't recall, no.
 - Q. Let's zoom out of that paragraph and let's go to the second. Second, it says the structure of this hedge fund makes it difficult to recover in the event of fraud or other misconduct because the hedge fund is the only entity we can go after as the other parties, specifically, the related hedge funds, the investment manager and the limited and general partners are all protected by corporate shield theories, limitation of liability clauses and indemnification clauses. Additionally, the Annuity Fund must agree to a broad hold harmless clause.

Mr. Husamudeen, at the time that the investment was being considered, were you party to any discussion about how the Annuity Fund might recover in the event of fraud or other misconduct?

- A. No.
- Q. Do you recall ever discussing what a hold harmless clause was?
- 21 | A. Excuse me?
- Q. Do you recall any discussion of what a hold harmless clause was?
- A. There was never any discussion. This document was never provided to me. I never saw this until --

- Q. Even without seeing this document, do you recall any discussion of what the document has discussed so far?
- A. No.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

- Q. Including from Mr. Seabrook?
- 5 | A. No.
 - Q. Directing your attention to then where it says third, third, the hedge fund's offering plan is very blunt about actual and potential conflicts of interest and all the involved partners and players can invest in products that benefit themselves or other entities even if those investments are at the expense of the Annuity Fund. Although we have requested a proposal from the hedge fund to address these conflicts, we

Do you recall any discussion of conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest involving Platinum Partners at the time that the investment was being considered?

- 17 | A. No.
 - Q. Do you recall any mention of a request for something to address conflicts of interest being rejected?

were told that the language would not be altered.

- 20 | A. No.
- Q. Finally, to direct your attention to the fourth paragraph,
 the beginning of it, fourth, the offering plan is similarly
 blunt that the investor should be prepared and accepts the risk
 of losing its entire investment. Was that something that was
 ever discussed that you were aware of at the time the

- 1 | investment was being considered?
- 2 | A. No.
- 3 | Q. I want to direct your attention to the next page. The
- 4 | letter is unsigned. Did you ever see a signed version of this
- 5 | letter?
- 6 A. No, sir.
 - Q. Did you ever see an unsigned version of this letter?
- 8 | A. No.

- MR. BELL: Why don't we take it down. Thank you, Ms. Bustillo.
- 10 Bustillo.
- MR. SCHECHTMAN: One second, your Honor.
- 12 (Pause)
- MR. BELL: Actually, why don't we put that back up.
- 14 | Why don't we go to that page it goes on.
- Can we just go to the end of the previous page first.
- 16 | I will start reading so we can conclude that sentence.
- 17 BY MR. BELL:
- 18 Q. 4th, the offering plan is blunt that the investor should
- 19 then accepts the risk of losing its entire investment and to be
- 20 permitted to invest, the annuity fund must represent that it
- 21 can withstand the loss of the entire investment and does not
- 22 | need its -- continue on the next page -- not need its
- 23 | investment to be liquid. As both of these factors are
- 24 | inconsistent with the needs of the annuity fund, it should not
- 25 make this representation. In discussion with the hedge fund's

attorney, however, we have been told that this representation must be made.

Do you recall being privy to any discussion of these issues at the time that the investment was being considered?

A. No.

MR. BELL: Let's go now fully to that last page, the third page, Ms. Bustillo.

BY MR. BELL:

Q. Let's go to the final small paragraph that begins as you consider. As you consider this investment, please also keep in mind that the amount invested should reflect the heightened risk inherent in hedge funds and that the annuity fund's initial investment with Intercontinental was 5 million and with Advent was 10 million.

I believe you mentioned Advent, Mr. Husamudeen. Do you recall what Intercontinental was?

- A. Intercontinental was a real estate investment company.
- Q. Do you recall seeing any discussion or hearing any discussion of a comparison between those investments and this investment while this investment was being considered?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. Now let's take this down. Thank you, Ms. Bustillo.
- 23 Did there come a time -- well, withdrawn.

After the January 2014 Annuity Fund Board of Trustees meeting, when was the next meeting of the Annuity Fund Board of

HAOJSEA5 Husamudeen - direct

1 | Trustees?

- 2 A. The next meeting took place in July.
- 3 | Q. Were you present for that meeting?
- 4 A. No, sir.
- $5 \parallel Q$. Why not?
- 6 A. I was on vacation.
- 7 Q. Did you later review the board minutes from that July
- 8 | meeting?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. So I'd like for us to publish Government Exhibit 311.
- 11 | Are these the --
- 12 THE COURT: Hold on.
- 13 (Pause)
- 14 BY MR. BELL:
- 15 Q. Are these the minutes you reviewed from the meeting you
- 16 | missed?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. It lists July 29th, 2014. Does that comport with when you
- 19 | missed that meeting?
- 20 | A. Yes. .
- 21 | Q. Can we go to the second page, please. There is a section
- 22 | called investment manager's reports. I think you mentioned
- 23 | this, sir, but generally what were the investment manager's
- 24 reports?
- 25 A. They were generally put in the minutes of the meeting,

reminding what was discussed in the prior meeting as far as
what the managers brought to the table when they would have to
come to quarterly meetings to tell us how the funds are doing,
how our money is doing, how much money they've made us or lost.
Q. I want to direct your attention to the very bottom of that
page. It says Gilad Kalter made Platinum Partners'
presentation. The hedge fund returned 3.09 percent since go
onto the next page its inception during March, 2014.
Platinum projected a 2014 return of 8 percent for 2014 but up
to 14 percent if certain transactions occur as planned.
Prior to reviewing these minutes, Mr. Husamudeen, had
you been notified that the annuity fund board invested money
into Platinum Partners?
A. No.
Q. Was this the first that you knew?
A. Well, from the January meeting and the decisions made there
I didn't appear at the meeting until November. I believe,
as a matter of fact, November which was when I saw these
particular meet minutes.
MR. MAZUREK: I had trouble
THE COURT: Would you repeat that answer into the
microphone again.
THE WITNESS: Prior to these minutes here we are
looking at now are from the July meeting. I would not have

seen these minutes until the following trustees meeting which ${\tt I}$

HAOJSEA5 Husamudeen - direct

1 | believe was in November.

- 2 BY MR. BELL:
- Q. Prior to reviewing those meeting minutes, did anyone else tell you that the due diligence had cleared and that the fund
- 5 | had, in fact, invested in Platinum Platinum?

6 MR. SCHECHTMAN: I apologize. There was an answer 7 that began from the January meeting.

THE COURT: Let's get the Court Reporter to read the question and answer before the last questions and answer.

(Record read)

- 11 BY MR. BELL:
- 12 Q. Prior to reviewing those minutes, had anyone formally
- 13 notified you that the annuity fund had, in fact, put money into
- 14 | Platinum Platinum?
- 15 | A. No.

8

9

10

- 16 Q. I want to shift gears for just a moment.
- Did there come a time you learned from money from
- 18 | COBA's general fund had been invested in Platinum Partners?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. When did you learn that?
- 21 A. I learned that in June of -- I learned that in June of
- 22 2014.
- 23 | Q. Where were you when you learned that?
- 24 A. I was at the Puerto Rican Day Parade, the union was
- 25 marching in the Puerto Rican Day Parade, and at the end of the

parade the COBA treasurer brought that to my attention. 1 2 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Can we object. I don't think there 3 is any reason for us to leave the courtroom, but could Mr. Seabrook have one minute bathroom break. 4 5 THE COURT: Let's do this. Let's go ahead and take a 6 10-minute break, and then we will have a little bit more 7 testimony and dismiss you for the day, all right? Don't discuss this case with anyone else. Don't discuss it amongst 8 9 yourselves, okay? See you soon. 10 (Jury excused) 11 THE COURT: May I have counsel and the parties hang 12 here for a second. 13 (Pause) 14 THE COURT: You can sit down. Let's discuss a couple of things while the jury is on its break. Before he does that, 15 Mr. Seabrook can use my robing room. You can use the restroom 16 17 in my robing room. 18 DEFENDANT SEABROOK: Thank you, Judge. 19 (Pause) 20 THE COURT: So let's wait for Mr. Seabrook to come 21 back and discuss a few things. 22 (Pause) 23 THE COURT: Are counsel all here? Mr. Seabrook here? 24 DEFENDANT SEABROOK: Thank you so much. 25 THE COURT: Let's discuss a few things real quick.

One thing that we need to discuss is my Deputy has informed me that several of the jurors have expressed some concern. They have been bumping into -- you can sit down -- they have been running into the parties and counsel and people who they perceive to be family members of the parties in the halls, in the elevators and things and the like. Nothing inappropriate has been expressed to them, but they are somewhat disquieted by that.

So we want to make sure the jurors are as comfortable as possible. I don't want to do anything extreme at this point like trying to clear the hallways or any of that stuff. It may be helpful if the counsel and parties can wait 10 minutes before you leave once the jury is dismissed so they can get their belongings. It is primarily during the breaks so we don't have any misunderstandings. Counsel want to be heard on that or have any thoughts on that?

MR. BELL: That is fine, your Honor. I think that here it is tough because there are only so many ways out.

There is kind of a narrow rabbit run. That makes sense and we are happy to stick around for as long as it takes.

MR. MAZUREK: We are fine with that. The other concern is during breaks, if the breaks are only 10 or 15 minutes --

THE COURT: I hope the only break we are going to have was 30-minute break. We weren't going to have any other

breaks. I understand. Anything else from defense counsel on this? The other thing we should discuss because we want to get some more testimony for this jury before we let them out at 2:30 is screen angles.

So it hasn't been an issue yet because everything that the government has sought to introduce has come into evidence. To the extent that there may be some disagreements later on, the jurors can see your screens from where they are, so to the extent — at least some of the jurors can — to the extent you are trying to show something only to the witness counsel for the government and maybe the defense table may be okay, but if you angle your screens a little bit, that would be helpful.

The other thing I am noticing some of the jurors are adjusting their glasses and the like trying to read the items on the screens when they're published, and it has been helpful the government has enlarged them somewhat. Keep in mind the jurors' angle to their screens is different than the angle that counsel have at their tables and different than the angle that I have, and many of the other jurors like me have certainly crossed the Rubicon into middle age and their vision is such it may help to have it a little bit larger.

The other thing I want to talk to counsel about is my closing instructions to the jury today. I plan to just tell the jury, as I told them before, don't do any independent research related to this case or the parties in this case.

Don't discuss this with anyone else and ask them to get here at 1 9:00 o'clock. Sound good to counsel? 2 3 MR. BELL: It does. 4 MR. SCHECHTMAN: If you just add don't read anything. 5 THE COURT: And don't read anything. Make sure I 6 remember to say that, too. 7 The other thing is we had previously talked before we knew about Juror No. 1's mother's home health aid situation. 8 9 We talked about trying to say something extra to the jurors about getting here on time. Now that we have that information, 10 11 there is no need to show any shade at the jurors regarding 12 We just ask them to get here at 9:00 o'clock. 13 good? I let counsel get a quick two-minute break and bring the 14 jury in and finish up for the day. You can use the robing 15 room, too. 16 (Recess) 17 THE COURT: Let's get the witness here and let's go. 18 Let's bring the jurors in and have the witness take the stand 19 again. 20 A VOICE: I don't think Mr. Huberfeld is here. 21 THE COURT: Hold on. 22 MR. MAZUREK: We're here. 23 THE COURT: Let's go. 24 (Jury present) 25 THE COURT: Let's be seated. Let's continue. Go

HAOJSEA5 Husamudeen - direct

1 | ahead, counsel.

BY MR. BELL:

2

3

4

5

6

7

Q. Good afternoon once again, Mr. Husamudeen.

I believe that we left off a point where I asked you whether there was a time when you learned that operating accounts, general fund money, had been invested in Platinum Partners, and you mentioned June of 2014 at the Puerto Rican

- 8 Day Parade. What were you doing at the Puerto Rican Day
- 9 | Parade?
- 10 A. The union marches in all of the parades, and we were
 11 marching in the Puerto Rican Day Parade.
- 12 | Q. Who generally was there on behalf of the union?
- 13 A. Usually the entire executive board.
- 14 | Q. What was it that you learned and how?
- A. At the end of the parade, I was approached by COBA treasure

 Michael Maiello, who informed me and was complaining that the

 president invested \$5 million of the general fund money without

 speaking to the board, addressing the board or talking to the
- 19 | board about it.
- 20 | Q. Was that the first you heard of this?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. What was your reaction?
- 23 A. Well, my reaction was one of concern.
- 24 | Q. Why were you concerned?
- 25 A. I was concerned because that's something I felt -- I felt

- that is something that should have been discussed with the board.
- 3 | Q. Why?
- 4 A. Because we are on the board, and as far as the general fund
- 5 as we discussed, we're all trustees on that fund, and if you're
- 6 going to invest \$5 million of the general fund money, then it
- 7 | just to me made sense that you would discuss it with the board.
- 8 | Q. To your recollection, prior to that point had \$5 million
- 9 | from the operating account been brought to the attention of the
- 10 general executive board?
- 11 A. I'm not sure who else might Mike spoke to at that time.
- 12 | Q. Had it been raised at a meeting?
- 13 | A. Not that I recall.
- 14 Q. Had Mr. Seabrook ever broached the possibility of that sort
- 15 of investment from the operating account?
- 16 A. To the board?
- 17 | Q. To the board?
- 18 A. Not that I recall.
- 19 | Q. What was your understanding at the time as to how big a
- 20 deal \$5 million was?
- 21 A. For me, the bigger deal was just discussing it with the
- 22 board.
- 23 Q. Now, had you ever known the union to invest operating
- 24 | account money in a hedge fund?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. When you learned this at the end of the Puerto Rican Day
- 2 | Parade, what did you do?
- 3 A. I spoke with Norman.
- 4 Q. Where did you speak with Mr. Seabrook?
- 5 A. Somewhere at the end of the parade. I am not sure.
- 6 Q. Was anyone else present?
- 7 | A. No.
- 8 | Q. What, as closely as you can remember, did you say to Mr.
- 9 | Seabrook and what did he say to you?
- 10 A. I told him basically the conversation that was had with the
- 11 | treasurer and that the gist of the conversation is he should
- 12 | have addressed the board, he should have said something to the
- 13 | board about that, and at that time my opinion was you can't do
- 14 | that without talking to the trustees.
- 15 \parallel Q. What was the tenor of what you told Mr. Seabrook?
- 16 A. I don't understand.
- 17 | Q. What was your mood, your demeanor, the mood at the time you
- 18 | told Mr. Seabrook this?
- 19 A. Pissed off.
- 20 | Q. Were you loud?
- 21 | A. I guess I wasn't yelling, but, yes.
- 22 | Q. What specifically, as best as you can remember, that you
- 23 | told Mr. Seabrook?
- 24 A. Pretty much, you know, like what the fuck is your problem?
- 25 You can't do that, you know?

2

7

- Q. What, if anything, did Mr. Seabrook say to you?
- A. "It's making money."
- 3 | Q. Did he, did Mr. Seabrook provide any other reason why he
- 4 | had done this without notifying the rest of the board?
- 5 A. No, not that I recall, no.
- 6 | Q. Did the conversation end there or was there more to it?
 - A. I think it pretty much ended there.
- 8 | Q. I want to show you what has been marked for -- I'll just
- 9 put this on your screen for the moment -- Government Exhibit
- 10 | 1035. It was mentioned in the email stipulation among the
- 11 | emails that came in from Platinum.
- 12 MR. BELL: Again depending on how defense counsel
- 13 | feels about this, we can admit it or work around?
- MR. MAZUREK: No objection.
- 15 MR. BELL: The government offers 1035.
- 16 THE COURT: It is in without objection.
- 17 (Government Exhibit 1035 received in evidence)
- 18 MR. BELL: Can we publish that to everyone, please.
- 19 | Would the jury just signal when you have it.
- 20 BY MR. BELL:
- 21 | Q. This is an email, dated May 20, 2014, from a person named
- 22 | Uri Landesman to Andrew Kaplan, someone named Michael Kimelman
- 23 and someone named Joe Mann. The subject line, COBA.
- 24 At the time, Mr. Husamudeen, did you know any of these
- 25 people?

- 1 A. No.
- Q. It says, "Norman allegedly coming in here to sign papers next week. No calls to anyone there, please."
- Now, you worked at COBA's offices at the time, right,
- 5 Mr. Husamudeen?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Do you recall there being any communication or any calls
- 8 coming in from Platinum Partners to COBA at around that time,
- 9 at around May 20th?
- 10 | A. No, no.
- 11 | Q. Let's take that down.
- Now, Mr. Husamudeen, did there come a time when you
- 13 | learned that the annuity fund board invested still more money
- 14 | into Platinum, not the \$10 million that we've discussed, but
- 15 another set of money?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Approximately when was that?
- 18 | A. I believe that was at the November Board of Trustees
- 19 meeting.
- 20 | Q. What did you learn at that meeting?
- 21 | A. Well, from the minutes, that we invested another 5 million.
- 22 | Q. What was your understanding of when that had happened?
- 23 A. From the minutes at the last meeting where I wasn't, at the
- 24 July meeting.
- 25 | Q. The one that you missed?

HAOJSEA5 Husamudeen - direct

1 | A. Yes.

- 2 | Q. Now, Mr. Husamudeen, at any point over this entire
- 3 | timeline, 2014, were you aware of any possibility that Mr.
- 4 | Seabrook was receiving kickbacks in exchange for the union's
- 5 | investment in Platinum?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. Were you aware of any relationship between Mr. Seabrook and
- 8 | the hedge fund prior to that January 2014 meeting?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 | Q. Or at any point over the course of 2014?
- 11 | A. No.
- 12 Q. I want to direct your attention back to that first meeting,
- 13 the 2014 meeting where Platinum presented.
- 14 How would the knowledge of something like that, a
- 15 payment relationship between Mr. Seabrook and people affiliated
- 16 with Platinum Partners, have affected your approach to the
- 17 decision to invest union money in Platinum?
- 18 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Can we make clear this is what we
- 19 what we call a hypothetical question.
- 20 | THE COURT: Objection?
- 21 MR. SCHECHTMAN: Objection.
- 22 | THE COURT: Please rephrase the question, please,
- 23 | counsel.
- 24 MR. BELL: Sure.
- 25 BY MR. BELL:

- Mr. Husamudeen, I am about to ask you a question about how 1 you would have valued something had you known it. 2 3 Had you known of a payment relationship between Mr. 4 Seabrook and people affiliated with Platinum Partners, how 5 would that have affected your decision as a trustee to invest in Platinum? 6 7 MR. SCHECHTMAN: The same objection. 8 THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. 9 How would it have affected my decision? Α. Yes, sir? 10 Q. 11 Is that the question? 12 Q. It is. 13 Α. They would have never got an interview. 14 What do you mean by that? Q. 15 Α. If you're saying if I knew about a relationship between Mr. 16 Seabrook and the members of Platinum Partners, how would it 17 have affected my decision? 18 Q. Yes, sir. 19 What I am saying to you is that if I knew that, first of 20 all, I know there would be a conflict. Second of all, they 21 would have never gotten a meeting because I would never have 22 been a part of that. 23
 - MR. BELL: One moment, please.
- 24 (Off-the-record discussion)
- 25 I have no further questions for MR. BELL:

1 Mr. Husamudeen.

THE COURT: It seems to me that we're at 2:24. It is probably a good time to break for the day, so we're going to break for the day. I will give you the instruction I have given you before.

Do not read anything about this case, don't listen to anything about this case, don't do any research regarding any of the issues or the parties in this case. Don't talk to anyone about this case. Don't allow anyone to talk to you, and I will see you at 9:00 am tomorrow. Have a wonderful evening.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

So it seems to me that we can excuse the witness now. Is there any objection to that by the government or the defense?

MR. BELL: No, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just right before the break, the witness inquired and saw my mints and asked for mints. I will give him some. I want to let you know there is no ex-parte discussion.

Let's have the witness hold on here for a minute so the jurors can get out of here. Is there anything else -- we'll wait. I don't think there is anything else we need to discuss today or is there?

MR. BELL: We don't think so.

	HAOJSEA5 Husamudeen - direct
1	THE COURT: Counsel?
2	MR. SCHECHTMAN: My guess is we will get through maybe
3	more we'll talk about that afterwards.
4	MR. MAZUREK: I have one issue that I can raise from
5	an evidentiary point of view.
6	THE COURT: Does it have anything to do with this
7	witness?
8	MR. MAZUREK: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Just wait a couple of minutes and let the
10	witness get out of here and we will take up your other issues.
11	(Pause)
12	(Continued on next page)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

THE COURT: Okay. All right. On the record. The witness is excused. Thank you.

(Witness temporarily excused)

Okay, counsel.

MR. MAZUREK: Judge, at the end of this witness' direct examination there was some hearsay testimony elicited or testimony of out-of-court declarations by the witness and Mr. Seabrook. I understand that they're being admitted, I expect, under 801(d)(1) with respect to the comments that Mr. Seabrook had made to this witness.

Though I understand that that conversation has little to do with Mr. Huberfeld, since it's only a discussion relating to that witness and Mr. Seabrook, it would not otherwise be admitted against Mr. Huberfeld in a separate trial. So I just wanted to alert the Court. I haven't decided yet whether to ask for a limiting instruction, but I wanted to raise that issue and would, if I think one is appropriate. I'll alert the Court in the morning with the proposal.

THE COURT: Okay. Government?

MR. BELL: I recognize that the request hasn't come yet, but should one come, we will oppose it. This seems about as garden variety as the co-conspirator statements as it gets.

We actually would not concede Mr. Mazurek's argument that this is stuff that would not get in, were Mr. Huberfeld to be tried on his own. We'll see where his research takes him,

but if there is a request, this seems about as textbook as co-conspirator statements get. That's not something that's lost even if people have different domains of the conspiracy or even areas that they helped further. So we would oppose any such request for a limiting instruction.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll have to look at it when and if it's going to be submitted. I don't get the sense, again, that defense counsel is seeking to exclude the information, but is seeking some sort of potentially curative instruction so that the jury understands the value of this testimony. I'm not sure if defense counsel is indicating at this point -- well, I don't know what defense counsel's position is in terms of the relevance of this information to Mr. Huberfeld.

I'm not sure if your position is that it would be wholly irrelevant or only for certain uses in terms of the overall conspiracy because we are talking about the conspiracy charge here.

MR. MAZUREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, do you have a sense of where you're going with this right now? Tell me more about where you're going with this. Obviously, you haven't submitted this, but tell me what sort of curative instruction would you be looking for.

MR. MAZUREK: A curative instruction that the testimony that was elicited from this witness with respect to

the state of mind of Mr. Seabrook is not -- has limited relevance with respect to Mr. Huberfeld.

THE COURT: Let me just make sure I understand what you're talking about. Which statements are you talking about in terms of the state of mind of Mr. Seabrook? Because I'm not sure there was a whole lot of that directly coming from this witness. This witness is talking about his state of mind, but give me a sense of what you're talking about.

MR. MAZUREK: It's a conversation that he replayed from the Puerto Rican Day Parade between Mr. Seabrook and him with respect to why Mr. Seabrook went ahead and invested money, or that he invested money from the general fund.

THE COURT: And you're talking about the statement, it's making money? Is that what you're talking about? You're talking about the conversation that came out on direct where this witness said, you know, something to the effect of, you know, What the French toast are you doing? Why are you investing this? And Seabrook responds with: It's making money, is that what you're talking about or what specifically are you talking about?

MR. MAZUREK: That was part of the conversation, as I remember it. I want to look over the transcript again this evening, if I might, because I think there's a little bit more to it.

MR. SHECHTMAN: Can we just talk among ourselves

HAOPSEA6

tonight, and if there is something, we'll write the Court a letter. I don't want to make more of this than I think may be useful.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else that we need to deal with today?

MR. BELL: Not from us, your Honor.

MR. SHECHTMAN: Not from us, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let's get defense counsel to go ahead and get me your letter by -- well, I guess, have you decided whether or not you're submitting --

MR. MAZUREK: I haven't decided. I just wanted to alert the Court. It was maybe precipitous, but I wanted to alert that it may come.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this, if you are not going to be submitting anything, can you let us know that by 4:30 today?

MR. MAZUREK: So long as I have the transcript.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Then make your submission by 6:00 this evening. I will give the government until 10:00 to respond, and there won't be any reply, and we'll see where we are. Anyway, does that schedule work for everyone?

MR. MAZUREK: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BELL: Sure, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else we need to deal with

HAOPSEA6

today from either side?

MR. BELL: No, your Honor.

MR. SHECHTMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Once again, let's try to get counsel here ten minutes before 9:00 to avoid any unnecessary bumping into jurors and get the parties here at ten minutes before 9:00 as well.

What do we have on tap for tomorrow in terms of witnesses?

MR. BELL: Your Honor, I would expect, obviously,
Mr. Husamudeen's cross, however long that is. Mr. Kalter, as
we mentioned before, will testify. Assuming we get through
with that, there are two very brief witnesses. I think
somebody from the NYPD with respect to license plate reader
data, somebody else to get in some auditing documents. Those
should both be very quick. Should we get through all of that,
and I hope and anticipate that we would. I think the great
likelihood is that we would call Mr. Rechnitz.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. SHECHTMAN: No, your Honor.

MR. MAZUREK: No.

THE COURT: All right. See you tomorrow.

(Adjourned until 9:00 a.m. on October 25, 2017)

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	ELIAS HUSAMUDEEN
4	Direct By Mr. Bell
5	GILAD KALTER
6	Direct By Mr. Capone
7	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS
8	Exhibit No. Received
9	652 and 656
10	657 and 658
11	1501, 301, 303, 304, 305, 309, 3312, 146
12	401, 403, 405, 406 and 408
13	711, 706, 707, and 703 148
14	1503
15	1027
16	1072
17	1035
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	